

JPRS-UPS-87-019

19 MARCH 1987

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

19 MARCH 1987

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

- New Komsomol Draft Statutes Incorporate Projected Changes
(KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 25 Dec 86) 1
- Turkmen Buro Criticizes Gosagroprom's 'Serious Shortcomings'
(TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, 12 Dec 86) 18

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

- 1941 GOSR Celebration Recalled
(KOMUNISTI, 6 Nov 86) 19
- Georgian Social Science Lecturers Need Upgrading
(K. Shelia; KOMUNISTI, 25 Nov 86) 19

CULTURE

- Zalygin Honors Academician Likhachev, Reviews New Book
(Sergey Zalygin; NOVYI MIR, No 11, Nov 86) 21
- IZVESTIYA Calls for Greater Openness on TV
(Aleksandr Maryamov; IZVESTIYA, 17 Jan 87) 29
- Actor M. Ulyanov Castigates Opponents of Reform
(Mikhail Ulyanov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 7 Feb. 87) 31
- Actor Mikhail Ulyanov on TV Movie About Lenin
(L. Sechenova; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 25 Jan 87) 41
- Ideological Dangers of Informal Music Associations
(Moscow Domestic Service, 12 Jan 87) 44

Soviet War Memorial Competition Criticized (A. Sergeyev; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 30 Jan 87)	47
Klimov Addresses Cinema Workers' Plenum (SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 24 Jan 87)	48
PRAVDA Reviews Abuladze Movie 'Repentance' (Georgiy Kapralov; PRAVDA, 7 Feb 87)	56
'Repentance' Points Up Need for 'Moral-Revolutionary Renewal' (Niko Chavchavadze; KOMUNISTI, 18 Oct 86)	57
Norwegian Expert on Georgian Language Eulogized (Ioseb Megrelidze; KOMUNISTI, 23 Oct 86)	57
Maker of 'Repentance' Lauded for Courage to 'Tell Painful Truth' (Revaz Dzhaparidze; LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO, No 44, 31 Oct 86)	58
'Repentance' Reveals Nature of 'Totalitarianism' (Archil Gogelia; KOMUNISTI, 4 Nov 86)	58
Georgian Branch of 'Culture Fund' to Have 'Considerable Leeway' (Tengiz Buachidze Interview; KOMUNISTI, 24 Nov 86)	59
Kazakh Writers Union Forum on Internationalism (A. Shimov; QAZAQ ADEBIYETI, 5 Dec 86)	61

SOCIAL ISSUES

Moscow TV: Supreme Court Chairman on Openness in Law (Vladimir Ivanovich Terebilov Interview; Moscow Television Service, 23 Jan 87)	62
Doctor Complains About Poor Medical Training for Drug Treatment (V. Gogin; IZVESTIYA, 13 Jan 87)	75
Georgian Justice Officials Warned of Masses' Moral Judgment (G. Giorgadze; KOMUNISTI, 25 Oct 86)	76
Crackdown on Anonymous Letter Writers Urged in Georgia (T. Dzhafarli; KOMUNISTI, 31 Oct 86)	77
Georgian MVD Chief on 'Criminal Traditions,' Other Problems (G. Chikvinidze; KOMUNISTI, 11 Nov 86)	77
Dangers of Fake Cognac in Georgia Include Cirrhosis Among Youth (Rezo Dvalishvili; KOMUNISTI, 22 Nov 86)	78
KOMUNISTI Reports Narcotics Cases (KOMUNISTI, 25 Nov 86)	79

Problems of Nationalism in Kirghizia Noted (SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 27 Jan 87)	80
Uzbek Official Hails Interrepublic Cadre Exchange (Timur Alimov; IZVESTIYA, 2 Jan 87)	84

REGIONAL ISSUES

Georgia: Extent of Snowfall Damage, Rescue Work Noted (G. Lebanidze; PRAVDA, 15 Jan 87)	90
Economic, Ecological, Social Problems of Georgian Highlands (KOMUNISTI, 29 Oct 86)	92
Georgia Militia Contingent Accompanied Virgin Lands Harvesters (D. Berdzenishvili, I. Nikiforov; KOMUNISTI, 29 Oct 86)	93
Long-Term Georgian Regional Development Program Examined (Sh. Amashukeli, G. Chikvinidze; KOMUNISTI, 1 Nov 86) ...	93
More Independence Urged for Georgian Highland Kolkhozes (N. Dzhavelidze; KOMUNISTI, 1 Nov 86)	94
No 'Outside Workers' Needed Yet To Build Trans-Caucasus Railroad (D. Bitsadze; KOMUNISTI, 6 Nov 86)	94
Georgian Unit Formed to Monitor, Intervene in Occupational Health (A. Kikodze; KOMUNISTI, 16 Nov 86)	95

/9986

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

NEW KOMSOMOL DRAFT STATUTES INCORPORATE PROJECTED CHANGES

Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Dec 86 pp 2-3

[Draft of the Statute of the Komsomol with projected changes]

[Text] The Komsomol is an amateur social and political organization, which unites the progressive part of Soviet youth.

The Komsomol is an active assistant and reliable reserve of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is the nucleus of the political system, the guiding and directing force of Soviet society.

The Leninist Komsomol is an integral link of the political system of Soviet society and acts in full conformity with the Constitution and the laws of the USSR, in close cooperation with state and public organizations.

The Komsomol works under the guidance of the CPSU and perceives the whole purpose of its activity in the realization of the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the decisions of the party.

The Komsomol takes an active part in the realization of the tasks of the systematic and comprehensive development of socialism and the further advance of Soviet society toward communism on the basis of the acceleration of the social and economic development of the country, in the administration of state and public affairs, and in the solution of political, economic and socio-cultural problems.

The chief task of the Komsomol is the education of active and conscious builders of the new society, who are dedicated to the ideals of communism, hard-working, and ready for a heroic deed in the name of the socialist Fatherland.

The Komsomol helps the party to form in young people a Marxist-Leninist world view and class consciousness and sees to it that every Komsomol member piously carries out the Leninist precept "To study communism" and in a proper manner continues the revolutionary, militant, and labor traditions of the Communist Party and the Soviet people. The highest honor for a Komsomol member is to become a member of the CPSU.

The Komsomol expresses the interests of the young people, concerns itself with the development and fuller satisfaction of the socially significant needs of

of young men and women and defends the rights granted to young people by the Soviet state. Komsomol organizations make use of the right of broad initiative in the discussion and formulation, before the appropriate party organizations and state organs, of questions concerning the work of the enterprise, kolkhoz, institution, and educational institution and take direct part in their solution, especially if they concern the labor, everyday life, instruction and training of young people.

For the Komsomol, the following Leninist precept is unshakeable: "The league of communist youth must be a shock group, which extends its assistance in any work and manifests its initiative."

The Komsomol builds its work on the basis of the strict observance of the principle of democratic centralism. The most important condition of the successful activity of the Komsomol is the expansion and intensification of intra-league democracy--the collective nature of the leadership, the all-round development of the initiative and independent action of the Komsomol members, openness, criticism and self-criticism. The strength of the Komsomol is in the unity of its ranks, based on ideological conviction, selfless dedication to the party, creative activeness, organization and discipline of the Komsomol members. The Komsomol frees itself of persons who violate the Statute of the Komsomol and compromise the high calling of Komsomol member through their conduct.

The Komsomol is an active participant of the international democratic youth movement. The Komsomol is constantly intensifying its cooperation with the youth organizations of the fraternal socialist countries and promotes the strengthening of the unity of actions of the communist youth leagues on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian socialist internationalism; it maintains relations with other youth associations in the interest of the struggle for peace; and it develops the movement of solidarity of youth with the fighters against imperialism and for national and social liberation.

I

The Members of the Komsomol, Their Duties and Rights

1. Membership in the Komsomol is open to any young person of the Soviet Union who recognizes the Statute of the Komsomol and takes an active part in the construction of communism, works in one of the Komsomol organizations, implements the decisions of the Komsomol, and pays the membership dues.

Young men and women, ranging in age from 14 to 28 years, are accepted into the Komsomol.

2. The Komsomol member is obligated:

a) To be an active fighter for the realization of the general line and the decisions of the party, its domestic and foreign policy, to take part in the political life of the country and in the management of state and public affairs, to serve as a model of the fulfillment of civic duty, and to link his labor, study, training and education with participation in the building of communism.

b) to set an example in work, study, and military service, to save and increase socialist property, to attain an increase in labor productivity, the improvement of production quality, and the introduction of the achievements of

science and technology, as well as resource-saving technologies, to observe labor and state discipline, and to make a maximum contribution to the acceleration of the socio-economic development of the country;

c) to be persistent in mastering Marxist-Leninist theory, to continuously increase his educational, political and cultural level, to wage a resolute struggle against any manifestations of bourgeois ideology, private property psychology, religious prejudices, and other views and morals foreign to the socialist way of life;

d) to promote the strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and of the fraternal relations with the youth of the countries of the socialist commonwealth and with the progressive youth of the entire world, to carry out the ideas of proletarian, socialist internationalism, and to conduct a tireless struggle for peace;

e) to be a selfless patriot of the Soviet Fatherland, ready to sacrifice for it all of his strength, and if necessary, his life, to strengthen the defense might of the USSR, to study military affairs, to exercise vigilance, to preserve state secrets, to steel himself physically, and to engage regularly in sports and physical culture;

f) to occupy an active civic position and strictly observe the norms of communist morality, to affirm the principle of social justice inherent in socialism, to put public interests above personal ones, to be honest and truthful, sensitive and attentive to people, and implacable toward violations of socialist legality;

g) to strengthen the ranks of the Komsomol in every conceivable way, increase its militancy and organization, show initiative and independent action, to strictly observe Komsomol discipline, equally obligatory for all members of the Komsomol, to carry out social assignments conscientiously, and carry tasks to their conclusion;

h) to develop criticism and self-criticism, to fight against window-dressing, conceit, careerism, and deception, to decisively repulse any attempts to suppress criticism, to take a stand against bureaucratism, formalism, and for organization in intra-Komsomol life, to boldly uncover shortcomings in the work of the Komsomol and strive for their elimination, and to report them to the Komsomol organs, all the way to the Central Committee of the Komsomol.

3. The Komsomol member has the right:

a) To elect and be elected to Komsomol organs;

b) to freely discuss questions of the work of the Komsomol at Komsomol meetings, conferences, congresses, sessions of Komsomol committees, meetings of the aktiv, and in the youth press, to introduce proposals, and to openly express and defend his opinion prior to the adoption of a decision by the organization;

c) to criticize, at Komsomol meetings, conferences, congresses, and plenary meetings of committees, any Komsomol organ and any Komsomol member, regardless of the position occupied by him;

d) to turn to the Komsomol organization with the request for a recommendation to join the CPSU;

e) to participate personally in Komsomol meetings, sessions of the bureau and the committees, in the discussion of the question of his activity or conduct;

f) to turn with questions, applications and proposals to any committee of the Komsomol, right up to the Central Committee of the Komsomol, and to demand an answer on the substance of his appeal.

Komsomol organs are obliged to examine applications and proposals of Komsomol members with sensitivity and attentiveness and to take the necessary measures in response to them. Persons who are guilty of the suppression of criticism and persecution for criticism must be held strictly responsible, right up to exclusion from the ranks of the Komsomol.

4. The Komsomol accepts progressive young people who are devoted to the Soviet Fatherland. Acceptance into membership of the Komsomol is carried out on an individual basis.

Procedure of acceptance into membership of the Komsomol:

a) Those entering into the membership of the Komsomol present the recommendations of two Komsomol members, whose length of service in the Komsomol is no less than 1 year, or the recommendation of one member of the CPSU, who know the persons being recommended through joint studies, labor activity and social work. Pioneers joining the Komsomol present the recommendation of the council of the pioneer group, which is given the same status as the recommendation of one Komsomol member. Those giving recommendations bear the responsibility for their recommendation and help those entering the Komsomol to take an active part in the life of the primary organization.

The Komsomol organization verifies the preparation of the entering person for practical tasks and assignments;

b) the question of acceptance into the Komsomol is discussed and decided by the general meeting of the primary organization or the organization with the rights of a primary organization; the decision is regarded as adopted if no less than two-thirds of the Komsomol members present at the meeting vote for him. The decision of the organization with the rights of a primary organization concerning acceptance into the Komsomol becomes effective after confirmation by the committee of the Komsomol of the primary organization. On the basis of the decision of the primary organization, the raykom or gorkom of the Komsomol makes a decision concerning the issue of a Komsomol membership card to the person entering the Komsomol;

c) Komsomol service of those entering the ranks of the Komsomol is calculated from the day of the decision of the meeting of the Komsomol organization concerning acceptance into the membership of the Komsomol.

The Komsomol member carefully preserves the Komsomol membership card and wears the Komsomol badge as a symbol of his membership in the Komsomol.

5. Members of the Komsomol who have attained the age of 28 leave the Komsomol if they are not elected to Komsomol organs, are not involved in Komsomol work, and are not pioneer leaders.

Note. Tenure in the Komsomol, upon application of a member of the Komsomol, may be extended by a decision of the primary Komsomol organization for a term of up to 2 years.

6. In accordance with the Statute of the CPSU, the Komsomol recommends the most worthy Komsomol members [for membership] in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The question of the recommendation of Komsomol members to join the party is examined in the primary Komsomol organization. On the basis of its representation, the decision concerning the recommendation of a Komsomol member for party membership is made by the raykom or gorkom of the Komsomol. The Komsomol organizations are responsible for the recommendation of Komsomol members for party membership.

7. The procedure for the registration of Komsomol members is determined by the Central Committee of the Komsomol, failure to observe it constitutes a serious violation of intra-Komsomol discipline. A Komsomol member, who has left the organization without removal from the Komsomol register, upon the expiration of 1 year may be removed from the register as having de facto lost his relationship with the Komsomol, the decision about which is made by the primary Komsomol organization and forwarded for confirmation of the raykom or gorkom of the Komsomol.

8. Komsomol organs must control the timely payment of Komsomol membership dues. The question about a member of the Komsomol who has not paid the membership dues without valid reasons in the course of 3 months is subject to discussion in the primary Komsomol organization.

9. A Komsomol member is made answerable to the Komsomol for failure to fulfilling the requirements set forth in the statute and for other misdemeanors. For insignificant misdemeanors, measures of education and influence in the form of friendly criticism, the administration of a reprimand, warning or instruction must be applied. The following penalties may be imposed on a Komsomol member: Placement on reprimand, a reprimand or severe reprimand, reprimand or severe reprimand with entry into the registration card. The extreme measure of punishment is exclusion from the Komsomol.

The question of the imposition of a penalty on a Komsomol member or his exclusion from the Komsomol is decided by a meeting of the primary organization. The decision concerning exclusion from the ranks of the Komsomol is considered adopted if no less than two-thirds of the Komsomol members present at the meeting voted for it. In the case of a Komsomol member being made to answer to the Komsomol, the primary organization is informed about this by the higher organ. Persons who have committed misdemeanors and are being punished as criminals are expelled from the Komsomol.

In examining the question of making a Komsomol member answerable to the Komsomol, a maximum of attention and objectivity must be guaranteed. No later than a year after the pronouncement of the penalty for a Komsomol member, the Komsomol organization hears him in regard to how he is correcting the shortcomings that were allowed.

10. The question of making members and candidate members of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Committee of the Komsomol of the union republics, the kraykom, obkom, okruzhkom, gorkom, and raykom of the

Komsomol, as well as members of the auditing commission of the Komsomol, answerable to the Komsomol is discussed in the primary organizations, and decisions concerning the imposition of penalties on them are taken in the usual manner.

Proposals of Komsomol organizations concerning the expulsion of members from the Komsomol are communicated to the appropriate committee of the Komsomol to whom the Komsomol member in question belongs. Decisions concerning the exclusion, from the Komsomol, of members and candidate members of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Committee of a union republic, kraykom, obkom, okruzhkom, gorkom, and raykom of the Komsomol and members of the auditing commissions, are taken at a plenum of the corresponding committee by a two-thirds majority of its members.

11. A Komsomol member who is expelled and a Komsomol member who is given a penalty retains the right to make an appeal within 2 months to the higher Komsomol organs, right up to the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol. Appeals are examined by the appropriate Komsomol organs within a term not exceeding 2 months from the day of their receipt.

II

Organizational Structure of the All-Union Komsomol Intra-Komsomol Democracy

12. The guiding principle of the organizational structure, life and activity of the Komsomol is democratic centralism, which means:

a) The elective nature of all leading organs of the Komsomol from top to bottom;

b) the periodic accountability of the Komsomol organs before their Komsomol organizations and before the higher organs;

c) strict Komsomol discipline and the subordination of the minority to the majority;

d) the unconditional binding force of the decisions of the higher Komsomol organs for the lower ones;

e) collectivity in the work of all organizations and leading organs of the Komsomol and personal responsibility of every member of the Komsomol for the fulfillment of their obligations and Komsomol assignments.

13. The All-Union Komsomol is built in accordance with the territorial-production attribute: The primary organizations are created at the place of work or study of the Komsomol members and are combined in rayon, city, and other organizations on the basis of territory. The organization which combines the Komsomol members of a given territory is of higher standing with respect to all Komsomol organizations constituting it.

14. The highest leading organ of the Komsomol organization is: For the primary organization--the general meeting and the conference; for the rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray organization--the conference; for the Komsomol of

a union republic and for the All-Union Komsomol--the congress. The meeting, conference, or congress are competent when more than half of the members of the Komsomol organization or the elected delegates take part in them.

15. The general meeting, conference, or congress elect a committee, which is the executive organ and directs all of the current work of the Komsomol organization.

In the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, the central committees of the union republics, kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms of the Komsomol, an apparatus is created for current work in regard to the organization and verification of the execution of decisions, and the extension of assistance to lower organizations in their activity. The structure and staffs of the Komsomol apparatus are determined in accordance with the procedure being established by the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

16. Elections of Komsomol organs in primary organizations and delegates to rayon and city conferences are conducted by open voting. Elections of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, kray, republic, and central Komsomol organs, as well as delegates to city (with rayon division), okrug, oblast and kray conferences and congresses--[are conducted] by closed (secret) voting. During the elections, Komsomol members have the unrestricted right of the nomination, rejection, and criticism of a candidate. Voting must take place for each candidacy separately. Candidates are considered elected if more than half of the participants in the meeting, conference or congress voted for them.

In the elections of all Komsomol organs the principle of the systematic renewal of their composition and the continuity of leadership is observed.

17. The members of the leading Komsomol organs must set an example of political maturity, efficiency, initiative, organization, and high morality, they must regularly provide information about their activity to the Komsomol members who are members of the corresponding elective organ. If a member of the Komsomol organ does not fulfill these requirements, he may be removed from its membership.

The question of the removal of a member or candidate member of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, the Central Committee of the Komsomol of a union republic, kraykom, obkom, okruzhkom, gorkom, or raykom from membership of a Komsomol organ is decided by open voting at a plenum of the corresponding committee. In the primary organization, the question concerning the removal of a member of the committee is decided at the general meeting. The decision is regarded as adopted if no less than two-thirds of the votes of the members of the committee or organization will be cast for it.

The question of the removal of members of the Central Auditing Commission of the All-Union Komsomol and the auditing commissions of the local Komsomol organizations from the membership of these commissions is decided at their sessions and in accordance with the procedure stipulated for members and candidate members of Komsomol committees.

18. The free and businesslike discussion of questions of Komsomol work in the All-Union Komsomol and in all its organizations is an important principle of intra-Komsomol democracy. Only on the basis of intra-Komsomol democracy can a high degree of creative activity, initiative and independent action of members of the Komsomol and conscientious Komsomol discipline be secured.

The Komsomol, in every conceivable way, develops criticism, self-criticism, and openness, utilizing them for the improvement of their activity and the prevention of shortcomings in the work of the members of the All-Union Komsomol and the Komsomol committees and organizations.

19. The highest principle of Komsomol leadership is collectivity--the indispensable condition for the establishment of a Leninist style in work, the development of activeness and independent action of Komsomol members, and the correct training of cadres--a reliable guarantee against errors and violations of the norms of intra-Komsomol life.

The collectivity of leadership presupposes personal responsibility for the assigned task and constant control over the activity of every Komsomol organization and every worker.

20. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, the central committees of the Komsomols of the union republics, the kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, raykoms, and the committees of the primary party organizations, during the period between congresses, conferences, and report and election meetings, keep the Komsomol organizations regularly informed about their work and about the implementation of critical remarks and proposals of Komsomol members.

The objective and timely information of higher Komsomol organs about their activity is also an absolute rule for committees of the Komsomol and primary organizations.

21. For the discussion of the most important decisions of the party and the Komsomol and the elaboration of practical measures for their implementation, meetings of the Komsomol aktiv of the rayon, city, okrug, oblast, kray, and republic Komsomol organizations may be called.

22. The committees of the Komsomol may create councils, commissions, and working groups on various questions of Komsomol work, as well as use other forms of involving members of the All-Union Komsomol in the activity of Komsomol organs in voluntary service.

23. The All-Union Komsomol, every republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city and rayon, as well as--on the basis of the decision of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol--some primary Komsomol organizations, have the Red Banner as the symbol of the honor and militant solidarity of the Komsomol members and their selfless devotion to the socialist Fatherland and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Komsomol cultivates loyalty and respect for the Red Banner in every member of the All-Union Komsomol.

24. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the committees of the Komsomol establish rewards and make wide use of them for the encouragement of the best Komsomol organizations and members of the Komsomol making a significant contribution to the cause of the communist education of young people and attaining high results in labor, study, military service, and social work.

III

The Higher Organs of the Komsomol

25. The highest organ of the All-Union Komsomol is the All-Union Komsomol Congress. Regular congresses are called by the Central Committee at least once every 5 years. The convocation of the congress and the agenda are announced no later than one and a half months before the congress. The norms of representation at the congress of the Komsomol are established by the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

26. The Congress:

a) Hears, discusses and approves the reports of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Auditing Commission of the All-Union Komsomol;

b) revises, changes and approves the Statute of the All-Union Komsomol;

c) determines the general line of work and the immediate tasks of the Komsomol;

d) elects the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Auditing Commission of the All-Union Komsomol.

27. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Auditing Commission of the All-Union Komsomol are elected in the composition that is established by the congress. In the case of the removal of members of the Central Committee, its composition is replenished from the number of candidate members of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

28. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, during the period between congresses, directs the entire work of the Komsomol, the local Komsomol organs, the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin, represents the All-Union Komsomol in state and public organizations, cooperates with them, expressing the interests of the youth, exercises the right of legislative initiative granted by the USSR Constitution, jointly with the party organs carries through the selection and placing of leading Komsomol cadres, approves the editorial boards of the Komsomol and pioneer newspapers and journals, creates various organs, institutions and enterprises of the Komsomol and directs their activity, distributes the funds of the Komsomol budget and controls its execution.

In the name of the All-Union Komsomol, the Central Committee carries on communication with foreign youth organizations.

29. The Central Auditing Commission of the All-Union Komsomol audits the observance of the established procedure of the passage of affairs, the work in regard to the examination of letters, applications and complaints addressed to the central organs of the Komsomol, the correctness of the execution of the Komsomol budget, including the payment, receipt and accounting of membership dues, as well as the financial and management activity of the enterprises and institutions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol. The activity of the Central Auditing Commission is built on the basis of the Statute, which is approved by the Congress of the All-Union Komsomol.

30. The Plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol is called at least once every 6 months. Candidate members of the Central Committee take part in the work of the plenum with the right of a deliberative vote.

31. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol elects a Bureau of the Central Committee for the direction of Komsomol work between Central Committee plenums and a Secretariat for the direction of current work, mainly in regard to the organization of control and verification of the execution of adopted decisions.

32. During the period between congresses of the Komsomol, the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, to the extent necessary, may call an All-Union Komsomol Conference for the discussion of urgent questions of Komsomol activity. The procedure for its conduct is determined by the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

IV

Republic, Kray, Oblast, Okrug, City and Rayon Organizations of the Komsomol and Their Leading Organs

33. The republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city and rayon Komsomol organizations and their committees work under the direction and control of the corresponding party organizations and organize the implementation of the decisions of the congresses of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

34. The basic obligations of the republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city and rayon organizations and their leading organs are:

a) Political and organizational work among young people and their mobilization for the realization of the tasks of communist construction, the acceleration of socio-economic development on the basis of scientific-technical progress, and the execution of state plans and socialist obligations; the active participation in the realization of the social policy of the CPSU and concern for the improvement of the conditions of work, study, everyday life, and recreation of young men and women;

b) the organization of ideological and educational work, the increase of the communist consciousness of young men and women, and the guidance of local youth mass media; the organization of the leisure of young people, their involvement in the work of defense and sports societies, and assistance in the development of socially significant forms of independent youth movement;

c) the realization of cooperation with the Soviets of People's Deputies, the trade unions, and other state and public organizations in the solution of problems of the communist education of young people;

d) the strengthening of the Leninist style in work, the carrying out--jointly with the party organs--of the selection and placing of Komsomol cadres, their upbringing in the spirit of communist ideology, moral purity, and high responsibility before the party and the Komsomol for the assigned task, and the

formation, in them, of innovative thinking, the need for lively work among the young people, and the ability to react, in a timely manner, to the processes taking place in the environment of young people and to influence them;

e) organizational and political consolidation, development of the initiative and independent action of the lower Komsomol organizations, the extension of practical assistance to them, the distribution of the means of the Komsomol budget in their organization, and the systematic provision of information to the higher Komsomol organ and accountability to it about their work.

35. The highest organ of the republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city, and rayon Komsomol organization is the Komsomol Congress of the union republic, and the conference of the kray, oblast, okrug, city, and rayon Komsomol organization, and during the period between them--the corresponding Komsomol committee.

36. A regular congress of the Komsomol of a union republic is called at least once every 5 years, a regular conference of a kray, oblast, okrug, city, and rayon Komsomol organization--once every 2 to 3 years. The appropriate committees of the Komsomol call the congresses and conferences and establish the norms of representation at them.

The congresses and conferences hear the reports of Komsomol committees and auditing commissions, discuss, at their discretion, other questions of the activity of Komsomol organizations, elect Komsomol committees and auditing commissions, delegates to conferences or congresses of the appropriate higher organizations.

37. The Central Committee of the Komsomol of the union republic and the kray and oblast committee direct the okrug, city, and rayon Komsomol organizations, verify their activity, regularly hear reports of the appropriate committees of the Komsomol, and represent the Komsomol in state and public organizations.

Komsomol organizations of the autonomous republics, as well as autonomous and other oblasts which enter into the composition of union republics and krays, work under the direction of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of the union republics and kray committees of the Komsomol.

38. The Central Committee of a union republic and the kray and oblast committee elect a bureau, including a committee secretary. For secretaries of these committees, at least 5 years of Komsomol service are mandatory, and they must be members of the CPSU. Chairmen of the councils of pioneer organizations, the heads of departments of these committees, and the editors of Komsomol and pioneer newspapers and magazines, as well as--at the discretion of the Komsomol committees--other Komsomol cadres, are confirmed at plenums of the committees.

For the examination of current questions and the verification of fulfillment, secretariats are elected in the Central Committee of the Komsomol of the union republic and in the kraykoms and obkoms of the Komsomol.

39. A plenum of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of a union republic, the kray and oblast committee of the Komsomol is convened at least once every 6 months.

40. The okrug, city, or rayon committee creates primary Komsomol organizations, directs their activity, systematically hears reports about the work of the Komsomol organizations, and keeps a record of the members of the Komsomol.

41. The okrug, city, or rayon committee elects a bureau, including secretaries of the committee, as well as approves the chairman of the council of the pioneer organization and the chiefs of the departments of the committee.

For secretaries of the okrug, city, and rayon committees no less than 3 years of Komsomol service are mandatory, and they must be members or candidate members of the CPSU.

Note. In some cases, members of the Komsomol, who are not members or candidate members of the CPSU, may be elected as second secretaries and secretaries of okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms of the Komsomol.

42. The plenum of the gorkom and raykom is convened at least once every 4 months, the plenum of the okruzhkom and the gorkom of the Komsomol of a city which has a rayon division--at least once every 6 months.

43. Candidate members of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of a union republic, a kray, oblast, okrug, city or rayon committee of the Komsomol, take part in the work of the plenums of the corresponding committees with the right of a deliberative vote.

V

The Primary Organizations of the Komsomol

44. The basis of the Komsomol are the primary organizations.

Primary Komsomol organizations are created at the place of work or study of Komsomol members--in plants, factories, sovkhoses and other enterprises, in kolkhozes, units of the Armed Forces, institutions, educational institutions, etc., when at least three Komsomol members are present.

In some cases, with permission of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of the union republic, the kraykom or obkom of the Komsomol, primary organizations may be created within the framework of some enterprises that are included in a production association and located, as a rule, on the territory of a rayon or several rayons of one city. If necessary, territorial primary Komsomol organizations may also be created in remote settlements with difficult access and at the place of residence of Komsomol members.

45. To increase the organization, activeness, and independent action of the members of the Komsomol, committees of the Komsomol may create temporary Komsomol organizations in Komsomol and youth detachments in agricultural work, student detachments, labor associations of pupils, dormitories for young people, clubs and circles at the place of residence, interest associations, etc.

46. In a primary Komsomol organization with more than 20 Komsomol members, by decision of the Komsomol committee, Komsomol organizations based on shops, shifts, sections, farms, brigades, departments, faculties, courses, study groups, classes, etc., may be created and granted the rights of a primary organization.

In primary Komsomol organizations and organizations with the rights of a primary committee, which have fewer than 20 Komsomol members, Komsomol groups may be created.

47. The highest organ of the primary Komsomol organization is the Komsomol meeting, which takes place at least once a month. In Komsomol organizations which have shop, brigade, course, and other organizations with the rights of a primary organization, the meetings, both the general meetings and those in the organizations with the rights of a primary organization, are conducted at least once every 2 months.

In primary Komsomol organizations with more than 300 Komsomol members, as well as in organizations of kolkhozes and sovkhozes with more than 100 Komsomol members, the general meeting is convened according to necessity within periods of time that are established by the committees of the Komsomol or upon the request of several organizations with the rights of a primary organization. Where the calling of general meetings is made difficult for production reasons or because of territorial disconnection, Komsomol meetings in some cases may be conducted for shifts, shops, courses, etc., with a single agenda.

48. For the conduct of current work, the primary Komsomol organization elects a committee, the organization with the rights of a primary committee--a bureau, and the Komsomol group--a group organizer for a 1-year term. In a primary organization and an organization with the rights of a primary organization with fewer than 10 Komsomol members, a secretary of the Komsomol organization and his deputy are elected. The quantitative composition of the committees and the bureau is determined by the meeting or by the conference.

49. Komsomol committees of primary organizations, depending on their membership composition and production features, with permission of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, may be granted the rights of a Komsomol raykom with respect to making recommendations for entry into the CPSU, keeping record of Komsomol members, and issuing Komsomol membership cards. These committees may be elected for a 2 to 3-year term.

Note. In some cases, with permission of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol, Komsomol committees, instead of a bureau, may be elected in the largest organizations with the rights of a primary organization and they may be granted the rights of a Komsomol raykom.

Komsomol committees with the rights of a raykom may be elected with an expanded membership, and a bureau is formed in them for the direction of current work. The sessions of these committees are held as necessary, but at least once every 3 months.

50. The primary Komsomol organization works under the direction and control of the corresponding party organization. It conducts work directly among the young people, it rallies them around the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, it actively carries out party directives in all spheres of production and public life, in every conceivable way develops the initiative and independent action of Komsomol members, involves them in social work, and links the Komsomol with the broad masses of the youth.

The primary Komsomol organization:

- a) Accepts new members into the All-Union Komsomol;

b) educates Komsomol members in the spirit of selfless devotion to the socialist Fatherland, the Soviet people, the Communist Party, and the cause of communism, of ideological conviction and communist morality worthy of citizens of Soviet society, and forms in young men and women a deep respect for the State Seal, the Flag, and Hymn of the USSR;

c) provides assistance to young men and women in the study of Marxist-Leninist theory in close connection with the practice of communist construction and conducts an uncompromising struggle against any manifestations of bourgeois ideology and backward views and attitudes;

d) takes an active part in the life and management of the affairs of the enterprise, kolkhoz, institution, and educational institution, helps Komsomol members and young people to prove their worth more fully in the various spheres of public life, develops in young people the skills of socialist self-government, and extends assistance, in their duties, to young men and women elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies, the leading organs of the trade union and other public organizations;

e) involves Komsomol members and young people in socialist competition for the fulfillment of state plans and obligations, mobilizes them for the solution of tasks of economic and social development, the intensification of production, the increase of labor productivity and production quality, the extensive introduction of the achievements of science and technology, advanced experience, collective forms of labor organization, and cost accounting, the intensification of the regime of economy and thrift, looks after the preservation and augmentation of the national wealth, the increase of the educational level, professional skill and economic knowledge of young men and women, and attains the strengthening of the labor discipline among young people;

f) makes use of the right, granted by the state, of participating in the solution of questions of providing incentives and awarding bonuses for young workers and employees, the distribution of housing and dormitory places for them, labor protection for juveniles, the dismissal of young people, and the use of funds for the development of cultural, mass [education] and sports work; cultivates in young people an uncompromising attitude toward shortcomings and toward everything that contradicts the principles of social justice;

g) comes forward as the organizer of the free time of young men and women, involves them in scientific-technical and artistic creative work, systematic pursuits in physical culture and sports, as well as tourism; it conducts work with young people at their place of residence and achieves the establishment of a healthful way of life;

h) involves Komsomol members in military-patriotic work, takes part in the preparation of young people for service in the ranks of the Armed Forces of the USSR, and educates young people in the spirit of constant readiness to defend the achievements of socialism;

i) conducts individual work with every young person, takes into account, in its activity, the special characteristics and special features of the various categories of young people, strengthens Komsomol discipline, forms in Komsomol

members, responsibility for belonging to the Leninist Komsomol, and hears their reports concerning the fulfillment of the statutory obligations and social assignments.

51. The Komsomol group realizes the decisions of the Komsomol organs and builds its work proceeding from the tasks confronting the production or educational collective. It helps every young person in work, study, and military service, it looks after the organization of his everyday life and leisure, after the creation, in the group, of an atmosphere of friendship, comradeship, exactingness, mutual assistance and solidarity, it comes forward as the initiator of useful affairs, and controls the fulfillment of social assignments by members of the Komsomol. Meetings in the Komsomol group are held as necessary.

VI

Komsomol Organizations in the Armed Forces of the USSR

52. Komsomol organizations in the Armed Forces of the USSR are guided by the Statute of the Komsomol and they work on the basis of the Instruction of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, under the direct leadership of the political organs and the deputy commanders for the political unit and party organizations.

The Komsomol organizations of the Armed Forces rally the young fighting men around the CPSU and educate them in the spirit of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, courage, bravery and heroism, Soviet patriotism, proletarian, socialist internationalism, selfless devotion and constant readiness for the defense of the Fatherland and the countries of the socialist commonwealth. In every conceivable way, they help the commanders, the political organs, and the party organizations in increasing the combat readiness of the troops and in strengthening military discipline, and they mobilize the young people for the successful fulfillment of the tasks of fighting and political preparation, the mastery of new technology and weaponry, and the irreproachable execution of their military duty, the orders and instructions of the command.

53. The Komsomol organizations of the Armed Forces actively promote the strengthening of the unity of the army and the people, maintain a close link with the local Komsomol organizations, help them in the military-patriotic upbringing of the rising generation, defense and mass [education] work and the preparation of young people for military service, and participate in the work of the local committees of the Komsomol.

VII

The Komsomol and the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin

54. The All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin is an independent communist mass organization for the children and juveniles of the Soviet Union. The goal of the pioneer organization is the education of youthful fighters for the cause of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The pioneer organization

in Soviet society includes children and juveniles in the practice of communist construction, promotes the all-round development of the individual, forming an active civic position of the youthful Leninists, and trains a reserve for the Komsomol.

The pioneer organization works on the basis of the Statute on the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin.

55. On the instructions of the Communist Party, the All-Union Komsomol directs the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin.

The leading organ of the pioneer organization is the Central Council of the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin, which is created by the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and works under its direction.

In the republics, krays, oblasts, okrugs, cities and rayons, the pioneer organizations are directed by the republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city and rayon councils of the pioneer organization, which are created and work under the guidance of the appropriate committees of the Komsomol.

56. The Komsomol organizations, on a daily basis, look after the formation, in pioneers, of a communist ideological outlook, devotion to the Soviet Fatherland, diligence, and aspiration for knowledge, see to it that the life of the pioneer detachments is interesting and rich in content, and help them in the determination and execution of socially useful tasks, in the development of the initiative and independent action of the youthful Leninists.

The Komsomol organs secure the active participation of all Komsomol organizations in the work with the pioneers, carry out the selection, placing, and training of the pioneer leaders, the leaders of circles, sections, clubs, and other associations of the pioneers, and create the necessary conditions for their clever and interesting leisure, technical and artistic creative work, and pursuits of sports and tourism.

57. The Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol and the Central Council of the All-Union Pioneer Organization imeni V. I. Lenin, the Central Committees of the Komsomol of the union republics, the kraykoms and obkoms of the Komsomol, jointly with the corresponding councils of the pioneer organization, publish pioneer newspapers and journals, as well as the literature needed by children.

VIII

The Financial Resources of the Komsomol

58. The financial resources of the Komsomol and its organizations are made up of membership dues, income from the publication of youth newspapers and journals, book production, measures of Komsomol organizations, youth tourism, from enterprises and institutions of the Komsomol, and other receipts.

The procedure for the use of the financial resources of the Komsomol is determined by the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol.

59. The monthly membership dues for Komsomol members are established on the following scale:

Those with monthly earnings of:

--up to 50 rubles	contribute 10 kopecks
--from 51 to 60 rubles	" 30 kopecks
--from 61 to 70 rubles	" 35 kopecks
--from 71 to 80 rubles	" 40 kopecks
--from 81 to 90 rubles	" 45 kopecks
--from 91 to 100 rubles	" 50 kopecks
--from 101-150 rubles	" 1.0 percent
--over 150 rubles	" 1.5 percent
	of monthly earnings

Note. The Komsomol members, who are simultaneously members or candidate members of the CPSU, are exempt from the payment of Komsomol dues.

60. Upon enrollment in the Komsomol, dues in the amount of 2 percent of the monthly earnings are paid.

8970

CSO: 1800/239

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

TURKMEN BURO CRITICIZES GOSAGROPROM'S 'SERIOUS SHORTCOMINGS'

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian on 12 December 1986 carries on page 1 a 650-word report on a session of the Turkmen CP CC Buro held on 11 December 1986. Participants discussed "serious shortcomings" in the Turkmen Gosagroprom's leadership. M.A. Charyev, first deputy chairman of the Gosagroprom, was severely reprimanded, and three deputies, G. Gubanov, S. Mikhammedov, and Ya. Dzhumaev, were relieved of their duties for shortcomings in leadership of the agriculture, fruit and vegetable growing, and food industry branches and for lack of initiative, deception, and bad management.

/12858

CSO: 1830/278

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

1941 GOSR CELEBRATION RECALLED

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 6 November 1986 carries on page 3 Distinguished Journalist Pilipe Makharadze's 1,000-word article recalling Stalin's bold decision to go ahead with the traditional celebration of the Great October Socialist Revolution in November 1941, when the Germans were nearly at Moscow's gates. It was a totally unexpected move, surprising friends and enemies alike, and foreshadowed the brilliant victory that was to come. The author depicts in some detail what Stalin was thinking as he went about implementing his decision and notes his Georgian accent as he placed key phone calls.

The episode is recounted in the context of the experience of a "senior lieutenant of communications," not explicitly named, who had the duty of checking the telephone system in Stalin's office every morning from 9:00 to 10:00. Stalin himself always worked all night until 5:00 a.m., left the office, and returned at 11:00. One morning in early November the lieutenant tarried to ask a favor: would Stalin see to it that his daughter, newly trained as a medic [feldsher] and due to be inducted, be kept close to home to care for her bed-ridden mother? Stalin's steely reply was that "things are grave all over—but gravest at the front. Go forth!" The lieutenant was not seen again in the Kremlin or at Kuntsevo. Instead, he stood in the ranks on Red Square on 7 November, listened to Stalin's inspirational speech to those assembled, and marched away with them directly to the front. Stalin's personal command to "go forth" rang in his ears for long afterward. The reader is informed that his daughter was in fact assigned to a Moscow military hospital, and her mother was placed there too. The episode was told to the author after the war, in the Batumi home of air force pilot Davit Chkhikvishvili during a visit by Chief Marshal of Aviation Aleksandr Golovancov.

GEORGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE LECTURERS NEED UPGRADING

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 25 November 1986 carries on page 3 a 2,100-word article by Foreign Languages Institute Professor K. Shelia, who is head of the Department of CPSU History and Scientific Communism there and also serves as chairman of the Republic Sectorial Coordinating Council for Scientific-Research Work in CPSU History. The article is pegged to the All-Union Conference of Heads of Social Science Departments that was held on 1-3 October in Moscow.

Professor Shelia's main focus is on the unsatisfactory state of social science instruction not only in higher but also in secondary schools. For one thing, students are bored with the old "question-and-answer" style of conducting seminars, which discourage bold discussion of tough issues, lively debate, and free expression of students' ideas. Unfortunately, most teachers and lecturers are simply not up to the task, largely because they have not been given the necessary grounding but also because they, some of them, don't care. The author gives a number of rough percentages (but no figures) on social science teachers in particular subjects who lack the requisite higher degree, and also states that younger specialists need to be brought along and encouraged.

Shelia urges the creation of a refresher institute in Tbilisi for the upgrading and retraining of social scientists, noting that such institutions already exist in Moscow, Kiev, Tashkent, and elsewhere. It could serve the whole Transcaucasus. He also urges the revival of social science seminars, perhaps broken down by sectors, in Tbilisi and the republic.

The author faults those who advocate exempting teachers and professors from research and publication: these are essential activities if teachers are to keep up with developments and make progress themselves. Too many in the social sciences who are doing research, however, have failed to contribute anything of value.

Finally, Professor Shelia states that social scientists are hampered in their mission because party organs and units neglect to inform them of their activities and intentions. Social scientists cannot function fully if they are poorly informed on these matters.

6854

CSO: 1830/252

CULTURE

ZALYGIN HONORS ACADEMICIAN LIKHACHEV, REVIEWS NEW BOOK

Moscow NOVYY MIR in Russian No 11, Nov 86 (signed to press 10 Oct 86)
pp 238-242

[Article by Sergey Zalygin "Culture and the Individual Personality: On the Occasion of Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev's 80th Birthday"]

[Text] "From the beginning of the development of literature even up to the present time... there stretches a line of the growth in the individual personality principle in literature." [Footnote 1] [The epigraphs and quotations are taken from the book of articles and essays by D.S. Likhachev, "Proshloye--budushchemu" [The Past--to the Future], (Leningrad, Nauka, 1985)]

Nothing offers such possibilities for the development of the individual personality as does culture.

A person becomes a learned person, we are talking respectfully--becomes learned and thereby we raise this concept to an even higher level, testifying to the miracle of the people's access to a high degree of culture and to the process for transforming the enigmatic force of the genes inside a person into evident scientific discoveries.

For example, a naturally gifted person becomes an artist: an artist of the word, a master of the stage, a painter or a musician--this is one more way culture makes itself accessible to a person.

Infrequently it does happen that a person "is imbued" with culture in its more general meaning, as a worldly phenomenon, and then he becomes its herald and being an artist or a scholar, he also becomes a cultural worker as well.

And finally, what is even rarer, but as if already rising above other people, a person finds the capability of seeing all the surrounding world and history and even the future of this world and of foreseeing through culture, transferring his own vision and understanding to others.

And here is yet one more thing: nature frequently permits a person to use the capability imbedded in him for great discoveries of those very phenomena which it gives him to discover and understand: at the same time, it is so complicatedly and cunningly encyphered in the genetic code that that which we define as capabilities and genius, humanity will probably never use completely consciously.

Both in science and in literature as a whole, the universal secret of our capabilities, of their origin and of their primary energy is always concealed and evidently will remain a secret; nevertheless, in using this energy the individual personality during its entire lifetime and activities can sometimes attain quite evident, specific and great discoveries.

And since we are using undefined quantities, this means, it precludes beforehand the obtaining of even an approximately predicted result.

We know that the capability for creation is matched up within a person with the capability for destruction, that alongside culture, which for us is true and good, there have long been parallel developments in both pseudoculture and anticulture, the results of which would be the apocalypse, the destruction of man and nature itself.

What is even more necessary in our time--a time of highly developed culture and technology--is to examine under what symbol of culture this level will be attained by one group of people or another. What do they represent--culture or anticulture?

Prominent people exert a continuous influence on our intellectual world and influence the everyday and elementary evaluations of that which surrounds us and is good or bad. And we dare not err in this matter.

However, such discernment is by no means simple or elementary. Pseudoculture can not be distinguished from culture by either word or gesture, but rather, it is distinguished by deed, by the consequence of the word or by its own erroneousness.

Nowadays we know that by far time does not always correct mistakes, that, despite the truth, it can both repeat them over and over and aggravate them. Our time is such that each lie, each even involuntary error can add to and reinforce a global and apocalyptic error, at the same time, detracting from and defaming true culture and the dignity of man and humanity, which alone can be set up to oppose the apocalypse.

"The Past--to the Future"

Academician Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev called his own book "Proshloye--budushchemu."

He seems to have left out the present. Did he forget it? But, perhaps, it is even worth forgetting? For its own sake. Indeed, if a person has had a past, especially a realized past, and if he foresees the future, then his present simply stands to reason. But if in our memory there is no past and no faith in the future--then just what is the present?

Now, at this moment, we do not live so much for this moment as we do for one of concern from yesterday or an hour ago, in brief--one that to some degree arose in the past.

We always live in expectation of at least the immediate future: today "we are arranging" our own tomorrow, we are working on it, on the coming autumn, winter, spring and summer, we live and think in time, but time never represents for us only the present moment, only the real moment; if this were the case we would not remember about our birth and we would not know about our coming death. We would not be people. An animal, for example, does not have any kind of developed notion about the past or about the future, so that it lives, as it were, not in time but in eternity, being, in fact, mortal. Yes, we know what the past is, it is what was: we know what the future will be, but the real moment--if it really exists--is ambiguous and, probably, for this reason we always want very much to value it, but we are unable to do so. The past--yes, the future--we are able to, but the real moment for us is eternally spent, spent again on the past, which we realize without end. But in no way can we send away with it our concerns or disentangle its consequences, and the same for the future, to which we find ourselves in permanent bondage. This is the lord which we wait upon every moment, but whose face we never look at.

I do not know what D. S. Likhachev was thinking about in calling his book "Proshloye--budushchemu," but he caused me to think precisely about all this. Especially since the purpose of his book is to cause one to think. And even--to guess (but in no instance to tell the future). At the same time, not the slightest doubt arises in the need to believe him as a representative and a figure of true culture.

In the book a number of questions is raised and some the author examines in detail, while others are given a cursory treatment, in general features, but this does not detract from their importance or interest in them.

"In essence, the conclusion of all the sciences to a greater or lesser degree are hypothetical. Many sciences appear precise only from a distance."

The precise sciences, so we are told, yield precise and, in any case, quite demonstrable solutions. Demonstrable within the limits of the problem set up by that science which this problem is part of. The accuracy of the solution in this instance has been predetermined beforehand by the accuracy and the definitiveness of the boundaries within which the problem is solved. This shows the advantages of scientific methodology, but not of the science itself, especially if you try to understand from science the theory of the world in its unity. We need only set for the precise sciences such a final goal as the theory of the unified world as a whole and their precision will prove to be extremely doubtful.

Even the humanities experience complexities: having barely participated in the solution of their partial task, they inevitably come up against the comprehensive question about the meaning for man's existence. The question "but why?" is present in any work of a humanities scholar and if the scholar gets away from it, the presence of this question does not become less evident. Otherwise, it should not be, inasmuch as science can not demonstratively define the boundaries of its own research, that it propose a priori that this is necessary.

It is obvious that all the sciences were created by man for a consumptive purpose, for the satisfaction of material and intellectual needs, but it has turned out that the sciences have overridden their user.

In fact, the expression "in the world of science," by which we mean the sojourn of scientists in an atmosphere of scientific research, can be interpreted completely differently today.

In fact, the entire world surrounding us has long been the world of science, since any object we use, be it a book, a table, a chair, paper, a pencil, footwear, any means of transportation or communication, any medicinal substance (even from folk medicine) appeared and became evident due to the influence of science and as a result of scientific studies.

Even we people have, in a certain sense, become to one another objects of science, inasmuch as we know and study the anatomy, the psychology and the origin of man, his laws, his interests and his way of living. We are science to one another. And nature is also a science to us and we know what the air is--this is the atmosphere, which possesses such-and-such composition and has such-and-such properties, what the ground is--this is geology and soil science, what the waters are--this is hydrology, what vegetation is--this is botany, and what man is--this is again anatomy and psychology, ethnography and demography, and sociology and a multitude of yet even more sciences, which also characterize people and define their properties and status in this world.

Thus, we think of the world in the form of formulas, laws and hypotheses and everything that remains outside these boundaries we have called empirical, however, empirical, although it is substantive, has the ring of "temporary" to us, because we are certain that, bit by bit, science will make efforts and what is empirical will also become realized and scientifically valid.

The sciences by far can not explain everything, but they are trying to explain everything and they explain not to the end but without end, and thus, without this process of explanation, we would not think about ourselves.

Yet, all the same, we are still, to a significant degree, empirical because we can not explain everything and can not foresee the consequences of scientific research and of the results of our existence under the aegis of science. The more "scientific" our existence has become, the more empirical our future has become, but we were finally convinced of this only when the abstract philosophical and theoretical problem "to be or not to be" became a practical one, even for that naked empiricism to which the sciences, and primarily the precise ones--physics, chemistry, mathematics and ballistics, have led us.

And in comparing "for" and "against" we today are not waiting for salvation so much from the precise and natural sciences, as from the humanities, which have proven themselves to be more "natural," for they have not divided up the world so assiduously into parts and particular tasks and have not used so skillfully the methods for separating these parts and tasks from one another and one from all the rest. It has turned out that they precisely support in us our potential for existence.

We desire that the scientifically based planning of our century receive not only technical expertise, but also humanitarian expertise so that in the calculated inputs of this planning a humanitarian input is included without fail and so that it is verified by the activities of the precise sciences and their resources. Indeed, if these resources are realized without being evidently necessary for our existence, they will appear as trouble and a great unhappiness for the world and will make its very existence questionable.

In no case can we confuse what is possible with what is permissible--of this we are convinced.

We desire that all the sciences, without exception, acquire the expediency which is defined by a sense of proportion and this proportion can be called ethics. Ethics are what all the sciences need first and foremost. But, evidently, the humanities should develop these ethics, since ethics are the essence of humanism.

And so it is--many of the sciences appear precise only from a distance. And for too long we have looked at them from the point of view of their own pertinence to themselves, whereas they should pertain completely to us.

The subordination of science and technology to the genuine and long-term interests of humanity, instead of to temporary and apparent interests, is the problem which people should solve today, without procrastinating.

And when CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev, in a statement to the Soviet television audience, said: "More than half of 1986, declared by the UN as the Year of Peace, is over. In extending its own unilateral moratorium, the Soviet Union is making one more considerable contribution to the attempt to ensure that this year remains in history as worthy of its designation"--this is all the same problem.

The world (and first and foremost, the USA) needs to put an end to nuclear testing if humanity is to continue to exist, if it does not--who knows...

"It is impossible to limit ecology only to the task of preserving the natural biological environment. In the life of man the environment created by the culture of his ancestors and by them themselves is no less important."

"Man is a morally settled being, and even for one who was a nomad--for him there was also a 'settled life' in the spaces of his unrestricted nomad camps. Only an immoral person does not possess a settled life and he is capable of doing away with the settled life for others."

Yes, there is no culture without history and if we want to preserve culture, we should also preserve history as well.

Properly speaking, all of our historical ideas are at the same time cultural ones. It has always been thus.

But today culture should be transformed even further into general and comprehensive ethics--into the ethics of science, of technology, of politics, of diplomacy, of education and of ethics itself also. Culture should be introduced into everyday practice. Up to now it has frequently existed, as it were, separately from the practice of life--for its own sake. Wise men long ago suggested that at some point culture will begin to determine completely the practice of life and the behavior of people and this will be a bright "turning point" in history, one illuminated by reason. But in the second half of the 20th century the question that will arise will be so tragic: if culture fulfills its own task--life will continue, if not--life will not continue, and even the wise men did not suspect this.

Culture has found that obvious necessity which it had always lacked.

The matter depends on us: will we, all of us, be able to understand this obviousness? Will we be able to be guided by it on a daily basis?

In order for culture to fulfill its own purpose, it should be permeated through and through with ethics. We are talking about what D. S. Likhachev calls the ecology of culture.

It is probable and may happen that at a certain moment the development and strengthening of the culture's ecology will seem to be even more important than the development of the culture itself. Indeed, in our people's culture, just in its soviet period alone, there has been so much experience accumulated that it simply can not be ignored. And time is needed in order for this experience to be assimilated.

"The value of culture is determined, first and foremost, by how it was created and what kind of 'memory' is 'imbedded' in it."

Culture's development did not follow the hours and the calendars and it would happen that over one century it would go smoothly and for a millenium it would happen that the development would be suspended, but this would by no means lead to the death of culture.

Culture, and right behind it, the people, its creators and bearers--this is so obligatory!--would perish when they lost their own history and their memory. In other words, they would again lose the ecology of culture and all that it entails--written and spoken language, scientific and moral learning and the experience of past existence.

And just as there is no culture without history, so also is there none without ecology--what else would preserve the history in it?

This situation is both universal and specific. An example of its specificity would be something like.. literary criticism.

Indeed, this, as D. S. Likhachev asserts, "...should help man to distinguish the genuine in art from the false, to distinguish pseudoart from truly popular art and to distinguish a false copy from an original work."

To distinguish.. But is not the task of distinguishing really an ecological task that is suitable for culture.

Yet another quotation:

"The most popular form of art is folklore in literary, musical and material (handmade articles) forms--almost devoid of what we would call bad taste or imitation art."

"Why? I think, precisely because popular art (folklore) is created by everyone, for everyone and within the framework of centuries-old tradition. In everything that the people have done there are common ideas about beauty."

Thus--again experience, again history and that means, again--ecology and its task.

We continually need to choose between acquisition and preservation.

What would be more profitable and more sensible--to build (acquire) a pulp and paper mill on Lake Baykal or to preserve the purity of the lake?

Today on the world market Baykal water can be sold for 50-75 kopecks for a large bottle. And really, would the TsKB [Central Construction Bureau] someday be able to turn out a product with such a high value and, at the same time, such a low production cost?

We are building a GES [hydroelectric station] and we need to acquire a source of cheap energy and to do this we are burning the earth. But the cost per kilowatt-hour is being reduced each year and new sources of energy are being discovered, but a new earth will never arise and the value of each hectare increases over time in a geometric progression.

Destructive activities against nature turn into destructive activities against culture as well, against its "settled life" and against its immutable concepts. It is impossible to piece together a homeland, people either have one or not, it is just a place to live; for whomever there is no understanding of people, there is the populace, there is no history, there are textbooks for schools and higher education institutions, and there is no native language, there is a means for intercourse.

In the popular understanding it goes like this: if there is none, we must do without! But the fact is: it should be understood, who today is disturbed by the names of Yesenin and Shukshin? Or Gogol? Tolstoy? Or Dostoyevskiy (about whom I had occasion to read that his "national narrow-mindedness invariably antagonizes")? To whom is it necessary that we forget the "Song of Igor's Campaign," the Latvian "Dayny", the "Manas," and the "Kalevala"? People frequently err in the evaluation of a writer's creativity during his lifetime, but memory never errs. It does happen that the most popular artist disappears from our memory after 3-4 years after his death, but one little known in his lifetime--by that same memory--is revived. What is this? It is ecology, almost unconscious, and the time has come to maintain it consciously.

A person, having once grasped the idea of the "ecology of culture," will not err in a comparative evaluation of phenomena, will not belittle another's culture and does not boast about his own.

Ecology is always cultural and genuine culture is always ecological.

"Genuinely new cultural value emerges in the old cultural medium... Something new in itself, like a self-sufficing phenomena, does not exist."

"Culture exists for those who possess their own cultural 'thesaurus'--a reserve of knowledge about the history of the culture."

"Realism--a style that most closely approaches an understanding of reality--develops within itself with particular intensity the individual author principle."

"In no one country in the world, from the very beginning of its existence, has literature played such an enormous state and social role as it has among the Eastern Slavs."

"A person living in the world remembered the world as a whole, as an enormous unity and became aware of his own place in this world."

"Literature critics have a large and crucial task--to cultivate 'intellectual receptivity'."

"In the study of literature it is necessary to have various themes and large 'intervals' precisely because the study wrestles with these intervals and strives to eliminate the barriers between people, peoples and centuries."

And one could further quote D. S. Likhachev and further reflect on the cause of each quotation--what a fascinating pursuit! And one might say--what a timely pursuit!.

But this is already a matter for the reader to whom the book "Proshloye--budushchemu" is addressed, and he needs to ponder the text and so on. He needs to continue his acquaintance with both the individual personality of the author, who represents our culture, and our culture, which produced this individual personality.

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Novyy mir", 1986

12752

CSO: 1800/195

CULTURE

IZVESTIYA CALLS FOR GREATER OPENNESS ON TV

PM221127 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 7

[Aleksandr Maryamov article: "Direct Speech"]

[Excerpt] Our present sharp turn toward renewal and openness implies joint efforts. This turnaround is aimed primarily at ensuring a restructuring in ourselves, at ensuring that we at last do what we are able to do and say what we think.

We could have heard Lenin's words about this on the screen almost 20 years ago. We could have heard his words that any bitter truth is more useful than a lie. We could have heard them but we did not: The cycle of films by M. Shatrov and L. Pchelkin entitled "Further Touches to V.I. Lenin's Portrait" existed for all these years outside our field of vision. I am sure that had this not been so, our inner need for changes and our readiness for them would today be higher.

In intensely following the amazing train of thought and listening to the sagacious clarity of Lenin's words, we all probably latch onto the fact that they are attuned to the time and coincide greatly with that is happening now and what we ourselves think. Is that perhaps why the fate of these movie chronicles was so difficult? Is that why our wait to see them was so doggedly and secretly delayed?

We recently learned of events in Alma-Ata. And rumors started once again. There would seem to be no reason to talk in whispers. The report did not come from the "grapevine"—the same day announcers read the report to the entire country on Central Television. Yesterday we would not have believed our ears—such a thing on television! But now? Even now, you know, not everyone believed it. The element of surprise, the improbable nature of the event, and habit had an effect. The fact that the report was not immediately followed up by correspondent reports from the scene also had an effect. And rumors immediately started. Tall tales, each more scathing than the last. And, let us be blunt, it was not possible to stop them straightaway. This means that there is something we still cannot do, something we have not thought of. Something we were still unable to do. And not just the television. This applies equally to the press.

Yet we do have experience of overcoming rumors. It was this experience that helped us to survive and overcome the Chernobyl tragedy. It opened our hearts to human suffering when we heard about the "Admiral Nakhimov" disaster. We all knew and were therefore together.

There is no scale for defining the level of openness: You can say such-and-such, but you still can't say that. If you've started, please keep going, carry on talking.

We all know quite well that partial and incomplete reports arouse distrust. Openness can only be called openness if it is exhaustively full and accessible to everyone. If it means exchanging opinions on all the problems that life places before us.

But on the whole it is pleasing that one-dimensional people mouthing paper platitudes have started to disappear from our television screens. And that real people--the young speakers from Balashikhi near Moscow on the "Allow Me to Speak" program, the disputants from "The 12th Floor," workers who argue from a state viewpoint, and academicians who consult with us--are becoming the main characters and the main heroes of the airwaves.

It is gratifying to hear direct, sensible talk.

Television is today reaching a new level of communication. The forms of this communication are very extensive. But above all they entail trust and a clear understanding that the viewer wants to know everything and should know everything.

/12858

CSO: 1800/334

CULTURE

ACTOR M. ULYANOV CASTIGATES OPPONENTS OF REFORM

PM131147 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 Feb 87 p 3

[Mikhail Ulyanov article under the rubric "Direct Speech": "It's Now or Never"—first two paragraphs are a SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] Hero of Socialist Labor Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov, people's artiste of the USSR, needs no special introduction. His work in movies and the roles he has played on the stage of the Yevg. Vakhtangov Theater are known to all of us! In this person breadth of creative potential and an actor's thirst for everything that is new are naturally combined with great public activeness. These qualities were vividly displayed in his latest work—the television series "Strands of a Portrait of V.I. Lenin," in which Ulyanov recreated the image of the leader of the revolution.

Mikhail Aleksandrovich's present activity abounds with public concerns—he is a member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and board chairman of the RSFSR Theatrical Figures Union.

A little time is needed in order to properly comprehend and assimilate what one might call the unfamiliar content of the CPSU Central Committee plenum which has only just ended and in which I had an opportunity to participate, and primarily of the report which excites one's thoughts and feelings. Even the initial effect and impressions are difficult to express: General and hackneyed phrases are obviously inappropriate here, and the task of selecting the only accurate words which would describe all this is not an easy one, either.

But here is something about which I have no doubts: There are now two definite views of life in our society. Some people consider, like the general secretary of the Central Committee, that we cannot retreat and that there is nowhere for us to retreat to. This is a revolutionary, profoundly party-minded, and courageous approach, I would say. And the only correct approach today. But there are others who believe that all this has been undertaken in vain, why "make noises" and stir things up—life went on and things were not all that bad. I am profoundly convinced that this watershed encapsulates the entire problem of the present. We will either march on until the end or we will halt halfway, roll up the restructuring, and then back to bogged-down immobility, back to the quagmire from which we will no longer be able to extricate ourselves.

This is not the first time people have been promised that life would be restructured on the principles of democracy, social justice, and Leninist norms, but on previous occasions all that died down gradually--and at times not so gradually--and was brought to zero. Today the party has raised the issue point-blank: We cannot continue living like this, it is impossible and unnatural. And hence: It's now or never, we have nowhere to retreat to. This is what the January plenum said!

But the whole point is: How? How should we live from now on? The fact that it is necessary to restructure, to seek and find new economic and legal levers which would make it possible to set in motion and accelerate the ponderous juggernaut of our cumbersome production sphere is as clear as daylight. The fact that new forms of democracy, self-management, and publicity are as necessary as the air that we breathe is as clear as daylight. And no one disputes this, at least not in the open. But restructuring is needed not only in the economy, not only in the minds, but also in numerous outdated structures and forms for the organization of society's life, and this would ensure a "second wind" being breathed through all of society's pores. And this task is much more complex, this is where the struggle for restructuring is being fought, the struggle for unconditional implementation of the course that has been taken. This is how I perceived the essence of what was said at the plenum.

Its revolutionizing nature underlies the very fact that cadres policy has been brought face to face with democracy and people's power. This is the key dual knot which must be undone as the only way to save society from the dangerous buildup of crisis phenomena, to dismantle the "machinery acting as a brake on socioeconomic development"--a braking mechanism which has taken shape in the country and which the previous leadership failed to promptly and fully examine and evaluate. It was revealed fully and with genuine Leninist principledness by the January plenum.

After all, crisis phenomena are created not by the system itself, but by specific people, by their attitude toward the cause, by their personal policy, by their practical actions within the parameters of their power. What was happening? Positions of responsibility were often occupied by people who were not so much competent in the given sphere, but who looked good on paper and whose life appeared irreproachable. Life itself led us to the conclusion that these criteria were in no way a guarantee that such "cadre workers" were capable of competently solving problems. It was also revealed that, in a large number of cases, this very irreproachability proved highly dubious: The report contained harsh and fair words about the extremely abnormal forms of negative processes resulting from the degeneration of a certain section of cadres.

It is to be supposed that the guarantee is provided not by compatibility on paper but by the considered selection and placement of cadres, by a person's competence and his compatibility with the position assigned to him and with those whom he is to lead. And a democratic and public

machinery of promotion is needed to ensure that such combination becomes the rule rather than the exception. It is at this watershed that, in my opinion, the fiercest battle is being fought. People oppose this, and the opponents are numerous: They are unwilling to "share power" with anyone, with some public opinion, with the masses, having got accustomed to total license topped up by lack of monitoring, at least of monitoring from below. How about that: Power in our country is supposed to belong to the people! How is it possible to share it or not with the people?

You may say: Were there not enough people in the country, even in the seventies, in the years of stagnation, who strove to extricate themselves from the stagnation despite the trends of that time? There were, and there still are. People like V. Kabaizze, an outstanding economic manager, like kolkhoz chairman D. Motornyy, like Academician B. Paton, like our theatrical figures G. Tovstonogov and O. Yefremov... I name only those whom I know personally, but these people are not to be counted only in single numbers, not even only in dozens. They are people who, generally speaking, have no need to review their stance even now—it has always been dictated by the one and only wish to help the party, the people, and individuals in their historical march, which in recent times developed so many symptoms of thrombosis.

We were, and even now we still are, haunted by the sinking feeling of immobility and immutability with which people wanted to, and did, cover up all problems quite stubbornly. They covered up history, they covered up economic decline and social injustice, they covered up the decline in artistic questing. Everything was covered up. By slogans—as if everything in our country were good and correct and we were marching along the right path.

It has transpired that we were far from marching along the right path in the economy, in the art of economic management, and even in our cadres policy. And so, the party headed by the general secretary has, as it were, halted the customary passage of time for a moment and to check whether we had not strayed away from the right path. And it did appear that we had somehow strayed away, and a radical reorientation became necessary.

So, how are we to structure our cadres policy and cadres so as to ensure that today's people, modern people, the best people really emerge in the forefront? How are we to release them, and indeed all of us, from the countless old-fashioned instructions and stipulations which reek of mothballs and, like weeds in an overgrown swamp, prevent us from either swimming or walking, prevent us from moving either our hands or our feet, and entangle the hands and feet of each operating economic unit and organism? How are we to release them from the willfulness of people who are more often than not incompetent but are nevertheless empowered to give orders? This is being said aloud today by kolkhoz chairmen, by sovkhoz and enterprise directors, and, incidentally, by leaders of artistic institutions.

And yet, these weeds are tenacious. Only a few days ago I read about the "peasant from Arkhangelsk" and his contract, who is now known to everyone. It appears that he is thorn in the side of some people from the oblast organizations. He delivers the meat, and he has boosted labor productivity. A good job, right? On the contrary: He's the wrong sort of character, a terribly restless person. And this proved to be more important than all the other indicators. The mind boggles: Here is a man willing and able to work for the good of us all, but he is not allowed to—something he does is not quite right, not according to the book... There you have it—a fierce fight with the gloves off.

So, how are we to put an end to these criteria for assessing man's "necessity" and "redundancy" which are contrary to his very nature? The plenum told us how once again and, I hope, for the last time ever: Only through the development of democracy.

My own experience in this respect is, of course, rather limited. But in the course of our theatrical congresses I did see for myself that bureaucracy, official willfulness, and any harmful tendencies find that democracy is an invincible weapon. Do you recall how, only a short while ago, the congress of the USSR Cinematography Workers Union was somewhat sensational and frightened many people? The result was, however, the sensational but democratic election to the union leadership of people whom the cinematography workers willingly entrusted with the helm, that is a fact. And they were so entrusted not because it was so ordered or "recommended," but because the desire to break away from the dull and viscous surroundings in cinematography prevailed, in the same way as the awareness that any break from these surroundings could be accomplished only by "pulling oneself up by one's own bootstraps" also prevailed.

That was the first experience of determining a union's leadership in a genuinely democratic fashion. The congresses of theatrical figures proceeded in an atmosphere that was already much calmer, as if that had always been the case in the past. And yet even now some people take fright and frighten others with possible anarchy. Democracy itself is still not with us in its genuine form, and we are already being intimidated, warned. The warnings are issued by those who are themselves frightened of this democracy. I know that many economic leaders—and not just economic leaders, either—are scared of an open conversation with their collectives, fearing that they may be proved to have no leg to stand on. And yet we need openness from below as much as we need oxygen, the air that we breathe, and that was said by M.S. Gorbachev and the plenum participants talked about it. A reliable lever of genuine power by the people was also named—responsibility and accountability by leaders not only upwards but also downwards. This is a mighty lever, and it must be brought into operation. After all, everything was turned upside-down: The person occupying the managerial seat, whose will determined not only the size of returns from a given organization or enterprise but even the fate and actual prosperity of his subordinates, was answerable for his actions exclusively upwards and never downwards. Only upwards! As regards

those below, he will keep silent, he will bide his time. And so they bide their time, keep silent, but do not work. They exist either exclusively for their own gratification or with a totally atrophied awareness of public opinion. But society cannot live in this way. This system is fatal for our society, but beloved by some people.

The party has decided to reverse this unnatural structure so as to ensure that every official bears vertical responsibility--not only upwards but also downwards. Only then will officials live and act in a different fashion. After all, well known methods were used, nearly always successfully, to pull wool over the eyes of superiors and to appear in the best possible light, but one's collective cannot be deceived--its members see everything. If we were to set this lever in motion in our life--and this depends on us all--we would stand to gain much.

Take even the simplest thing of all--elections to artistic councils in theaters. Everyone knows how dependent actors are on the leadership's will: You can leave a plant if you don't get on with its director, but you can't leave a theater easily--there simply are not enough theaters. Nevertheless, now that there are secret ballots and there is no fear that you will be noticed, the best people are already being elected to artistic councils on the whole. There you have this lever in operation. I am not saying that it is the solution to all the problems, but it does solve at least one: Public thinking within the theater is taking the form of a stance and is acquiring an outlet. Previously even that was lacking: I run things the way I like. Fair enough, provided you are clever and talented, but what if you are not? You need talent to "run things" successfully...

The outcome of all this can be seen only now, when directors need to be replaced here and there, and there are no directors to be found. Instead of training them in good time, we "liquidated them as a class" because they, the so-called "next-in-line," were as a rule middlemen rather than proper masters; they were not personalities in any case. And yet the theater needs individuality. It is my profound belief that each theatrical collective must have not just a manager but a leader, an inspired creative personality. This is a feature that is not handed over on appointment but, on the contrary, it must be the decisive element for promotion. And who else but the theatrical collective itself is competent to judge this? And once such a leader has been found, he must not be obstructed nor must he be given crutches to walk on--give him operational scope to fully unfold his gifts as director.

And now let us ponder: Are matters not the same in other subdivisions--kolkhozes, plants, organizations? I did read Ivan Vasilyev's remarkable articles: For years on end, any interest kolkhoz members may have had in their "leaders" was being killed. They were herded in to look over the next chairman, supposedly to elect him but in fact to rubberstamp his election: Take him as he is. And he could have been of any kind at all. But people were being gathered as a matter of

formality, so to say: Generally speaking, no one was interested in their opinion or their views--the agent had to "submit the candidacy" and that was all. We have now begun to talk about this, but you can see how slowly and with what obvious reluctance practice is being changed, if it is changing at all. This also means a fight--for restructuring on the one hand, against restructuring on the other.

So what kind of attitude is this toward individuals, toward the people, toward the new man that has developed in the 70 years of Soviet power! Where are the origins of, and what forces have imposed, this inbred mistrust for people, for those who work both in physical production and in spiritual production? Where are the origins of this doubt in the ability of Soviet people to bear collective responsibility for the section entrusted to them and to elect their own suitable leaders? Where are the origins of, finally, this persistent suspicion of artists and their ideological integrity? A few days ago the RSFSR Theatrical Figures Union Secretariat held a session to discuss its draft statutes. It appeared that certain representatives of the Federation's Ministry of Culture were evidently dissatisfied with the fact that the statutes were to affirm the union's right to equal participation in managing all the theater's fundamental problems jointly with leading cultural organs.

And yet, we must work together, we must work for the sake of party-mindedness and popular spirit, we have common goals without any separate spheres. Our common concern, our ultimate goal is to promote the creation of profound and talented productions and, generally speaking, works that the people need. So, where are the origins of such mistrust of both our rights and our potential?

I cannot fail to recall at this point the losses our art suffered through the fact that it was frequently managed by incompetent people who were, furthermore, suffering from the disease of suspicion. There were persistent attempts to "cut" scenes showing Kappel's psychological attack from the movie "Chapayev" in the past: How can this be? they said--this is glorification of the White Guards. And had they succeeded, this would have meant the emasculation of the movie. They almost carved up "And Quiet Flows the Don": What is Sholokhov doing, depicting Melekhov as neither ours nor theirs? And when I read it on the radio, I thought to myself: Had this epic work appeared in the seventies, it would never have seen the light of day. True enough, they also tried to ban "The Chairman" [Predsedatel] but tickets had already been sold, bringing in a large sum of money, and that was the only consideration that allowed it to go on. "Strands of a Portrait of V.I. Lenin" was not only "canned," but orders were issued to wipe the film itself so that not even a trace of it would be left--one copy was preserved thanks to the courage of a studio worker. Finally, Yefremov spent almost 2 years trying to get his "This Is How We Will Achieve Victory!" [Tak Pobedim] on the stage. Some lady in a senior position at the department responsible told me: "I looked at it--not everyone will understand it..." I objected then: What do you mean, it is about Lenin and "not everyone will understand it?"

But this axiom—"people (!) won't understand," "the people don't need this"—has existed and still exists in all spheres of art and literature. Some people did and still do undertake the function of self-styled spokesmen of the people, a function which, in their opinion, allows them to decide personally and without consulting anyone [yedinolichno i yedinonachalno] what the people do and do not need, what is and what is not allowed. And the reverse reaction produces inertia among the people. Why? Because people no longer believe that it is possible, necessary, and extremely essential to transform the people's strength into a lever which will squeeze out the bureaucrats, incompetent careerists, and time-servers who can exist only because they are not monitored from below.

Various expressions of concern regarding the press were heard at the plenum. Another symptomatic sign. The general idea was: Are the newspapers not wielding their pens rather too eagerly, are they not rather too sweeping? Well now, do they intend to start teaching us? Yes, there have been and probably there will be instances of lack of objectivity and even errors by journalists in elaborating on a subject, especially when criticizing. These are inevitable defects, like in any other work. People must be taken to task for this. But the fact that newspapers, journals, radio, or television have recently raised a number of most urgent and painful questions of social importance, questions which until quite recently were unmentionable, is one of the most important advances in society and social awareness, stimulated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th Party Congress and given a fresh boost by the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum. These are the gains that each and every one of us must protect. And there are people from whom they must be protected: They promote quietly, not too loudly, but persistently the idea that a newspaper must be pressured and muzzled, that it is impossible to live with these newsmen. Actually, what is there to muzzle? Newspapers and various other publications, heeding the commandment of the times, have only just launched a constructive and cleansing work in the spirit of publicity (anyone interested in the press has probably noticed how it has recently given a powerful platform to the voice of public opinion and the readers themselves, rather than to just professional journalists). Just like our theoreticians, they have not yet managed to reach the depths of what has happened and what is happening, but howls of protest can already be heard.

This was also discussed at the plenum. Two viewpoints were aired. They were not set out in black and white, but could be clearly felt. Some comrades are evidently worried: Newspapers are an irritant, they disrupt the quiet life. Here we have the very same watershed--the struggle for and against the very same thing. In this context, too, the plenum spoke out in favor of democratization and openness, whose most important vehicle is the press.

More or less the same reprimands are voiced against literature. This also worries me personally. It worries me because here we have again the same old "wary approach" dictated by deeply rooted mistrust and sense of

one's own infallibility and unfounded expertise. They say, for example, "linking" literature to restructuring: Why does literature need Aytmatov, Astafyev, and Rasputin with their "executioner's blocks," "sad detectives," and "conflagrations?" What has this to do, they say, with restructuring, this is nothing but demoralization because our reality is depicted as too ugly. But I personally perceive in these "executioner's blocks," "sad detectives," and "conflagrations" an enormous and justified alarm caused by the moral decline in a certain part--and quite a large part, at that--of our people: Where have we ended up, what is happening? A decline that is evidently not caused by writers' efforts, not by these writers, in any case. Because they do not use ointments, dubious from even a medical point of view, to cover up deadly diseases, they diagnose them. They diagnose them in order that they may be cured, whether by surgical or curative means, but cured nonetheless. This is an honest stance. And it is this honest stance that irritates some people.

Of course, our reality does not consist only of ugly phenomena, but they do exist and they must be at least discussed aloud. In order to do so, however, they must be perceived. There are quite a few people in the country who ponder our present reality with interest but also with alarm. They do not always have the power or even the opportunity to speak aloud, but those whom I mentioned in particular do speak on their behalf--writers will be writers.

Russian literature has always been a champion of everything advanced and current, and has always been a fierce adversary of everything that is black, obscurantist, and reactionary. Always, and at all times. It is still the same today, despite all its flaws. Does it make sense to shut it up at a stage when we all have embarked on a direct continuation of October, when we have decided to restore the continuity of time in all its purity!

It is a law of nature: Whenever a wind blows, it sweeps away the tumbleweed, and only the mighty trees, firmly rooted in the soil, survive. This is how it is in nature, this is how it also is in society. But we have contrived to overturn nature in this, too: Trees are at times uprooted, while the tumbleweed is anchored to the soil by firm nomenklatura ties, although the tumbleweed is totally inconsequential even though it may produce a lot of noise.

And so, pursuing this association with natural forces, let us revert to our democracy. I believe, I piously and totally believe in the people's wise ability of self-management, including their natural right to elect their own leaders, as proclaimed by the plenum. I believe because--apart from anything else--one more interest, personal interest, will operate. Basically, I am not stupid enough to saddle myself with someone who is evil by nature, and is incompetent and incapable to boot. I am not my own enemy. And I want my enterprise, institution, or sector where I work to the limit of my energy and ability and where I create the social product, to be headed by the best possible person whom I could trust. And then I

would "dedicate myself" to him, I would heed his words because I consider him authoritative. And if I do not trust him, if I know what he is really worth, why should I suffer because of him? I will either deceive him or depart from him.

The process, the scheme would seem to be utterly clear: I personally, together others like me, will elect the only one who would lead me where I have to go. But this process and this scheme are also difficult in the extreme. Difficult in the sense of education in the spirit of such democracy, difficult as regards their implementation. Because they, the time-servers, the untalented, the incompetent, and therefore the unneeded perceive this process, this scheme, as an insurmountable barrier in the way of their ambitions and aspirations. A struggle is being and will be waged also here.

It's all very well: Struggle, struggle, struggle. But where are the guarantees that its outcome will be to our advantage? Actually, I was asked this question on almost the very next day following the plenum. Such guarantees already exist, they were defined by the 27th Party Congress and they were talked about at the plenum. I can only say how I personally perceive them.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum made a trail-blazing decision, paving a broad path for genuine democratization of our entire life. Supported, naturally, by the people. There are many people in the country today, both Communists and nonparty people, who understand that there is no other way, that the only way out is via restructuring and qualitative transformation of society on the basis of people's power. At the same time, however, there are quite a few other people who do not want changes and are opposing this inevitable process by all means. There are also among us quite a few people who will resist right through to the end, stubbornly, and by various methods--from varnishing to banning, from some superficial semblance of democracy to actual blockage of the channels of democracy.

And how can an artist, if he really is of the party and of the people, sit on the fence at such a crucial time for the country! The time for shouting, when so much had to be said and was said, is, generally speaking, over. Now is the time to act! An artist's public stance can and must be expressed primarily in his works, in his creativity.

Let me say it directly, this is my personal opinion--but so far I have seen no works to reflect quite adequately the complex process taking place in the country. But I also see the reason why not: It is also a complex matter to depict. So far, this complexity makes it difficult to define any dominant features. But does this mean that we should turn back to dealing just with the hackneyed subject of bribe-takers? Very much, if not everything, has already been said, primarily by the party, and we shall refrain. But we are engaged on a quest, together with the party and the people. Artistic thought is engaged on a quest. We are not yet ready to

use our potential to reply to the numerous questions of the day. One point is clear, however: An artist, and art itself, have no right to stand aside--too many decisions are being made today, affecting both us and the coming generations. I can only affirm that an honest quest by everything that is honest, by everything that is of the party and of the people, is in progress in our art. We are prepared to take full advantage of the freedom of creativity that has been unshackled by the party's efforts, provided it means freedom to create for the people's benefit--there will be more than enough skill and ideological commitment for this, let there be no doubt about it. The only point is that no one must issue orders. Lead, guide--yes, but do not issue orders. This is Lenin's way. And this requires that the artistic process be headed by competent, authoritative people who will manage to guide it precisely, delicately, but sensibly and with ideological commitment.

This is not just a complex time, it is also dramatic. I can sense it: We are on a threshold and we may turn either this way or the other. Either a complete renewal of the "genes system," or we will all start talking at the same time, get bogged down in verbosity and fight each other. And then we will find ourselves again, for a long time, if not forever, stuck in a stagnant backwater without ebbs or flows, in a state of lethargy: After all, that will be nothing new...

This is precisely why I call on everyone, and primarily on my brothers in art, to side with what is good, I call on them to join the party in the camp of restructuring. It's now or never.

/12858

CSO: 1800/335

CULTURE

ACTOR MIKHAIL ULYANOV ON TV MOVIE ABOUT LENIN

PM011927 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Jan 87 p 4

[Report on interview with USSR People's Artist Mikhail Ulyanov "transcribed" by L. Sechenova: "Mikhail Ulyanov: Truth Without Embellishment or Omission"--no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is a SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] Many of us probably recall four evenings this January. A vast audience gathered around television sets to watch the series "Aspects of a Portrait of V.I. Lenin," made by Script Writer Mikhail Shatrov, winner of the USSR State Prize and playwright; Director Leonid Pchelkin, RSFSR people's artist; famous artists O. Yefremov, O. Tabakov, K. Lavrov, I. Kvasha, and I. Miroshnichenko; and many others. The part of Vladimir Ilich was played by Mikhail Ulyanov, USSR people's artist and winner of the Lenin Prize. Here is what he said about the series:

Twenty years is a long time for a movie or theatrical presentation. It often happens that when works are shown again 20 years later they appear naive and primitive.

But something amazing happened with the movies made for television in the late sixties and based on documentary scripts by Mikhail Shatrov, who attempted to reproduce the reality of 1918-1919. These films had been shelved for almost 20 years. And you would think that they would now seem a crude, timid, and naive attempt. But they evoked a tremendous response and comment from viewers. Why was that? Primarily, I believe, because they were timely. Yes, despite the delay, they were timely. It may even be said, however paradoxical it may seem, that the 20-year delay was a good thing. Had they been shown in those years, when the criteria were different and the view of history was different--selective, so to speak, choosing what was convenient and digestible--they would not have evoked the proper response. Against the general background of the whole embellished and glossy view of historical reality they would have seemed crude and probably would not have been understood.

It is precisely now, during the revolutionary restructuring of our life, when the craving for truth, the craving for honesty in all things, authenticity, tangible history, so to speak, a tangibility consisting not

of words, fine slogans, or verbal smokescreens but of all the "active seething bustle," [Mayakovskiy quote] all the multifaceted contradictions of the times we are living in, that such works are particularly necessary. Even today to attempt the truth is better than any obscure research, all novelty, innovation, or technical effect. Lenin's simple human idea, born of suffering and expressed through pain, is more powerful than any detective story. Because what viewers see before them is a great man thinking and seeking, doubting and suffering, finding himself in an impasse, agonizingly and fervently seeking a way out of that impasse and finding it--the whole process evokes a response in us today. It is attractive because it is the truth.

That is not all. Most unfortunately, while, during the many years of our Lenin series, Vladimir Ilich was most often portrayed historically, there was around him a historical vacuum--which, of course, was not the case. There were alongside him good soldiers, clever workers, and bad bureaucrats--it has still been possible to show that. But there were none of those people who made the revolution with him--they did not show us that. History knows that Lenin was part of an iron cohort of Bolsheviks but the entourage--a very strong, fierce, and dangerous one--of left social revolutionaries, left communists, maximalists, and so forth was in opposition, hostile. In the movie we saw it, and, for the first time, so clearly. This was a kind of test run, there will be further "investigations." At the Vakhtangov theater R. Sturua is now preparing to rehearse Mikhail Shatrov's new play "Peace or War," which will show characters such as Bukharin, Trotsky, and Lomov as independent, real people, not just as symbols. When the viewer sees and believes that Lenin is struggling against a real, tangible, and powerful individual, Lenin's strength and victory will be all the more credible and conclusive.

When Lenin struggles in a vacuum against faceless people, I realize that the work in question is playing a losing game. But we live in the kind of times when that game is over because it is harmful and corrupting. There is a different game in progress now, or more accurately a struggle not for life but to the death. How we emerge from it, how we survive will determine how we live. And we need to be as fearless as Lenin, and be fearless in viewing the world as it really is. We must not embellish our representation of it or take from it only that which suits our purposes but must accept it in all its complexity. We must be as truthful [pravdist] as Lenin, we have to be as utterly sincere in our desires, tasks, and aims and as relentlessly in our aims and purpose as Lenin was.

A good, kind man could not create the kind of historic event in the history of the peoples and mankind that Lenin created--a revolution in a great and colossal country. He was a genius, but he was also a man. He was changeable, but never idle. Never indifferent. And so this movie, I think, tries for the first time to remove from him the sheen of sentimentality, the gloss of cloyingness [medovost] which our productions have sometimes created around Lenin.

He was a real human being, but he was also a hard man, he was direct, like a knife, if he thought it necessary, he was kind when kindness was not an obstacle, and he was stubborn when he argued... And it is that human and civic content of Lenin's thought, spirit, and will which in actual fact form the very essence of the movie. And Vladimir Ilich's words reflecting his attitude to bureaucrats, crooks, slackers, deceivers, incompetents, and so forth sound like words spoken today. Yes, spoken today. That is what is meant by veritable truth, historical truth! Truth unadorned, undiluted.

/12858

CSO: 1800/335

CULTURE

IDEOLOGICAL DANGERS OF INFORMAL MUSIC ASSOCIATIONS

LD131626 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1415 GMT 12 Jan 87

[From the "Yunost" program]

[Text] [Reporter] Informal associations. Why are there so many of them these days? We put this question to Leninist Komsomol prize-holder and professor at Leningrad State University, Vladimir Timofeyevich Lisovski.

[Lisovski] If one is to speak seriously about informal associations in general, they are now more widespread than ever before and not just in our town. In the last 6 months I've had the opportunity of visiting, well, about 10 of the country's towns. There one also encounters these groupings and associations. Recently we had a very interesting discussion with heavy metal fans in Gatchina. When I arrived in Gatchina in the morning, their so-called president found me himself. He's an 18-year-old worker named Igor Voyakin, and, incidentally, I liked him. He's a normal guy. He found me. They'd told him that Professor Lisovski wanted to meet him.

So we're in Gatchina. I said, do you agree to meet us? He said, who else will be there? A secretary of the town party committee who deals with ideological work, Margarita Petrovna Lisina, will be there. He said, we'll meet them with pleasure. And they came along. There were 26 heavy metal fans at this meeting.

I have before me a questionnaire. At the moment, I am carrying out a poll in various parts of the country with a small questionnaire. So let's have a look. We ask you to reply to a number of questions relating to your leisure and so on. Do you consider yourself to be a modern person? Out of 26 heavy metal fans, every other one, 13, said that they do consider themselves to be modern; 12 of them said not quite, and one of them said no, categorically no. Well, I don't know who that is, the questionnaire is anonymous.

The second question: Some adults call the youth of today infantile. Do you agree with this? I repeat that these are only the replies of the 26 heavy metal fans I polled, because I can't talk here about the research being representative in any way. When I have processed 1,500 questionnaires, I think that then we'll return to this and see how young people reply.

But, all the same, it is interesting. Yes, one heavy metal fan agrees that adults regard them as infantile; no, say 20 heavy metal fans; partly, say four of them, and one of them did not reply to the question. Do you consider yourself to be an independent individual, I asked the heavy metal fans. Yes, said three. No, said 8, so that makes 11. Not quite, said 14, and 1 did not reply.

Well, what's interesting is how these heavy metal fans reply to questions on the musical groups they are drawn to. At the top of the list they are drawn by--well, I rate them as average--[Gunnar Graps'] group, a hard band, and they're drawn to it. In second place, we have Aquarium, our Leningrad group led by Boris (Grebechnyako). The kids, when you meet them and ask, well what do you want, what do you want to achieve, as heavy metal fans? Let's say, I've asked this question. They say, what we want to achieve first of all is this: We want to create, in counterbalance to Western heavy metal rock...

[Reporter, interrupting] ...their own heavy metal rock...

[Lisovskiy] ...their own Soviet heavy metal rock. How can you do that, kids? I don't want to cite the Leningrad rock band whose concert I recently attended. There were 25 of these fans there, fans of this rock club. Well, fanaticism, first of all, is a frightening thing; fanaticism is intolerant of heterodoxy. They feel that no other music should exist in the world apart from heavy metal rock, but then their favorite group started performing, you know--7 boys in the group all of about 30 years old, wearing short pants, about 30 years old, all of them running around in short pants. Well, isn't it time that they grew up? After all, they're affecting these 16-year-old fans. Well, I made out a few words. The fans' favorite song is Money is Paper. I said that, you know, in 1968. when I met the first hippies in Paris. They were also shouting this. I said you're mixing what is English with [word indistinct] and you're 7 or 8 years behind the English. I want to write myself off, he sings, songs like that. Well, I say, if you want to write yourselves off, then go ahead and do it. But why are you calling on 15-year-olds to write themselves off? That's what it's about.

We are for democracy, freedom, for individuality, but, you understand, all the same, let's say it honestly: When boors and riff-raff start using democracy, then this democracy can turn into brutality toward respectable people. Yes, you don't argue about taste, if taste has formed, but if it's embryonic...? Some people write: Well, do I really have to think when I'm listening to some Western broadcast about the connection between politics and music? I am interested in the melody, and let us recall that the ancient Greeks called those people interested in the affairs of their society by the good and clever word politikos, and that is political culture. The trouble is that today precisely there isn't enough political culture for a part of the youth, and not just the youth.

Here before me I have the program for a rock festival held in the summer of 1986 in Denmark, in Copenhagen, a friendship festival. There was a number of interesting groups there, they gave interesting performances. Well, there's a Danish group called Kalashnikov. They came up to our kids and asked them, Who's Kalashnikov in your country? Well, my friend, who was there, says, you know, it's a ballad by Lermontov about the merchant Kalashnikov. He says, come off it, in your country Kalashnikov is a submachine gun. Then if it's a submachine gun, if you know it's a submachine gun, then why do you call your rock band Kalashnikov? It's to show your aggression as Russians. There's your politics for you, and anything you like. I think that the kids have got to understand this.

Incidentally, it should be noted that a collection published not so long ago in the United States, which is called A Handbook on Waging Psychological Warfare says directly: Music is a means of waging psychological warfare, it is the first ambassador of Uncle Sam's good will. Does Uncle Sam care about musical education? This is what it's all about. Lenin emphasized that an illiterate person is outside politics, and Vladimir Ilich Lenin very sharply denounced puerile attitudes to politics. Today, especially when we're talking about music and musical passions and preferences, we encounter this very often.

/12858

CSO: 1800/333

CULTURE

SOVIET WAR MEMORIAL COMPETITION CRITICIZED

PM050945 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 30 January 1987 carries on page 4 under the headline "In Tribute to Poklonnaya Hill" an 1,800-word article by A. Sergeyev on the open competition organized to find a design for a World War II memorial to be erected on Poklonnaya Hill in Moscow. Sergeyev notes that the original design, "approved behind the scenes, in private," had been scrapped by decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Sergeyev notes that the "surprising haste with which architects and artists, professionals and dilettantes, produced their sketches (they were allowed from 1 September to 30 December last year) perhaps explains the carelessness of their work. But no haste can explain the astonishing similarity and striking banality of many designs." He criticizes the fact that "millions of Soviet citizens, living far from Moscow, have still not seen the designs." He accepts that the jury members face a hard task and echoes the views of hero of the Soviet Union Lieutenant General G.F. Samoylovich that the decision will be made after due deliberation and full consideration of the people's views.

/12858

CSO: 1800/333

CULTURE

KLIMOV ADDRESSES CINEMA WORKERS' PLENUM

PM301440 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 24 Jan 87 p 2

[Unattributed report: "A Time of Decision and Action: Second Plenum of the USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board"]

[Text] The 2 days of work of the Second USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board Plenum marked the time which has elapsed since the screen craftsmen's fifth congress and the months of intensive work on the draft document on the radical restructuring of the movie industry in the country.

Naturally, the report by E.G. Klimov, first secretary of the USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board, on the restructuring of the system of moviemaking and movie distribution in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 5th USSR Cinema Workers' Congress was heard with great attention (we publish an account of the report today). Naturally there was great interest in the speech by A. I. Kamshalov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, which was permeated by the idea of the need for close cooperation between the USSR State Committee for Cinematography and the union: Only together, without wasting a day, opening up the path for everything that is marked by talent, can we create the movies the people need, movies that play an active part in the process of restructuring public awareness.

The work then continued in 11 plenum sections--artistic, documentary, popular science movies, movie drama, theory and criticism, movie actors... More than 200 cinema workers spoke in the sections and at the plenary sessions. The draft document was discussed, many important aspects of it were analyzed, amendments were submitted, and new proposals were put forward.

Representatives of various professions within the movie industry spoke. They were all united by a burning desire to enrich the draft document with productive ideas and make it a tool in a truly all-embracing restructuring, which is so badly needed in the multinational Soviet cinema. And on studying the essence of the speeches and seeking to grasp the multiplicity of problems touched on at the plenum and the proposals submitted, one could not help thinking that in the very recent past it would scarcely have been possible to cover such a volume of work in so short

a time. Time had indeed been compressed and compacted to the point of solidity, and acceleration was no mere slogan, but the reality of the "current moment."

The concluding documents of the 2d USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board Plenum were read out; the plenum had taken place, it was unanimously noted, in full accordance with the spirit of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 5th USSR Cinema Workers' Congress. The plenum unanimously resolved to approve the draft document on the restructuring of the system of moviemaking and distribution as a whole, deeming it necessary to continue work on it in the light of the observations and proposals. Work to perfect the draft will be carried out by a commission, which is to prepare the final document by 15 March this year.

A commission to prepare a draft new union statute and a draft Cinema Foundation [kinofond] Statute was elected. Organizational questions were also examined.

The plenum granted M.A. Ulyanov's request to be released from his duties as secretary of the USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board in connection with his election as chairman of the RSFSR Theater Workers' Union Board. L.G. Mursa was elected secretary of the USSR Cinema Workers' Union Board.

Yu. P. Voronov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Culture Section, took part in the plenum.

[Klimov report] This second plenum is taking place rather later than we had planned. We could have met earlier, 2 or 3 months ago, for form's sake. We could have met and discussed a particular, relatively neutral problem requiring more simple preparations.

But we decided that we must begin not with the particular, but with the general, the cardinal. Time does not stand still. The first working plenum after the congress must be devoted--we were clearly aware--to the most complex and burning issue in our life in the movie industry, the question of its fundamental, radical restructuring. That is the most exacting, resolute instruction of our congress.

The work of preparing for this plenum was far from simple, and took much time and effort. Circumstances were such that both the initiative for radical restructuring and the drafting of a new pattern of moviemaking fell mainly onto the shoulders of the creative union. The struggle for the principles of reform was long and hard.

Some people wanted to confine things to an experiment at two or three studios, and review the results in the late nineties. Others, using all the latest modern vocabulary, proposed carrying out an impressive, all-embracing "cosmetic overhaul." Resolutely to change all the externals without changing the essence of anything. There were also the ideologists of "nonrestructuring," who reason something like this: "The USSR State

Committee for Cinematography has now reduced the pressure on us, and the union has consolidated its positions. Movies are accepted virtually without amendments. That is all we need. Who knows what will happen after changes? Things might get worse. So let us not touch anything."

It was and still is necessary to overcome such positions.

The arbitrary, bureaucratic principle of leadership of the moviemaking process has led us into a kind of impasse and brought us to the brink of crisis. The social and civic principles that distinguished the Soviet movie industry in the better periods of its existence were more and more often put into practice in the form of so-called "useful" ["nuzhnyye"] movies, as a result of numerous metamorphoses. The moral atmosphere in the movie industry changed in the direction of cynicism, pragmatism, and conformity. A whole cohort of cinema workers, or rather cinema hacks, appeared who were ready uncaringly to film or, as we say, "shoot" anything you like, as long as the work is tolerated, accepted without interference, and well paid. And preferably involves travel abroad. As often as possible. Hence the corruption, short-term campaigns, groveling before the bosses, and many other negative phenomena which, alas, are tenacious and have put down very deep roots.

And perhaps the saddest, most worrying problem to arise as a result of this is the problem of the young generation in the movie industry. With the exception of a few names (there are people who are gifted, honest, staunch, with inquiring minds--we are, of course, watching them hopefully), there is practically no new generation.

The thrust of the restructuring is directed against those who are used to leading by the old methods and do not want anything else, those who are snug in their spacious offices and would like to hold on to their privileges as long as possible. For people like that, it is a matter of indifference what they are in charge of--a vegetable store or moviemaking. A struggle against these people lies ahead. This struggle began long ago and continues to this day, and the end is not yet in sight. But we must also pick out and identify those who tag along with the process of renewal, who put on an act and call for changes more zealously than you and I. There are such people among us, they are close at hand.

The idea of restructuring, its basic principles, did not spring up overnight. If you subject our basic model to a "buffeting," as they say in aviation circles, and get rid of the details, the accretions, then what remains is the fuselage, the framework: financial autonomy, self-financing, and freedom for the basic creative components that make movies, a different kind of relations with the State Committee for Cinematography, with the distribution network, and so forth. All this had basically already taken shape in the mid-sixties, all this was well known to two or three generations of movie makers. Nor can we fail to recall today the practical experience acquired in the experimental studio and later the experimental creative association at Mosfilm, under the

leadership of Grigoriy Chukhrai and Vladimir Pozner. Let us pay tribute today to those of our comrades who pioneered the financially autonomous cinema. They were working for the future.

The opportunity tackle this task on a large scale, a unionwide scale, took shape only just over 18 months ago--after the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, which oriented the country toward the adoption of radical measures to improve the management of all spheres of our life.

And of course, 1986, the year of the 27th party congress, was a truly revolutionary year. It pointed the way to a radical turn toward new methods of work, and it is not only pointed the way, it created the necessary conditions for this--political, ideological, and psychological.

The party congress undoubtedly gave a boost, a stimulating impetus, to the Cinema Workers' Fifth Congress, which spoke out categorically and with a long-restrained passion in favor of the most radical changes in our entire movie industry.

Last year naturally did not and could not resolve all the accumulated problems. We had to single out the most important problems and concentrate on them.

As for the union's work style, the keynote speaker went on, on the whole it lacks practicality and organizational and management skills. True, as time goes on some experience is being acquired. Whereas, for instance, in the early stages a quite natural and entirely inevitable "debating-society" style and the associated denunciatory enthusiasm prevailed at sessions of the secretariat, commissions, and sections, now we are all increasingly drawn toward a constructive and, as far as possible, laconic and efficient approach to work.

The union has recently changed the character of its activity. It has taken on new functions and turned to face moviemaking head on--its planning, creative backup, and implementation. Naturally, the norms of relations within the organization have also changed--they could not but be renewed after the Fifth Cinema Workers' Congress. All this places two crucial questions on the agenda: To continue the further restructuring of the union's activity in this direction, perhaps reviewing some of its traditional structures, and to update and bring into line with actual practice the USSR Cinema Workers' Union Statute, which in its present form frankly cannot serve as a reliable legal foundation for many aspects of our activity.

But this work must be preceded by the elaboration of the concept of our union's strategic development.

It is clear that all this work is not a matter for our union alone. It is also the very important concern of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, and without its most effective, energetic participation no

restructuring is conceivable. Unfortunately our partnership with the State committee developed unevenly, unreliably, and for the most part very nervously from the outset. We hope that mutual understanding and businesslike cooperation with the State Committee for Cinematography will now become a reality.

Now to the restructuring itself, the basic model for the movie industry. Creative and economic autonomy for the studios, open, democratic forms of decisionmaking, the most favorable conditions for the work of truly talented and honest artists, financial autonomy, financial viability, and self-financing in moviemaking, nonstandardized, financially autonomous distribution... In fact, the model is described as basic precisely because it contains a kind of firm framework common to all, but certainly allows for modifications. That is to say, it presupposes a creative approach.

But it is important to realize now that some elements of the new system should be brought into play and introduced without delay, thereby opening, in practice, a transitional period. The worst thing now is to be complacent and continue to work "in no hurry," in the hope that everything will take shape of its own accord. Without us, nothing will take shape. I am not talking about inclinations toward deliberate sabotage, according to which it would be no bad thing to postpone the beginning of the restructuring indefinitely, so that everything happens some time in the future, without us. And preferably in another country. But everything will happen now, soon, and it is we who will do it.

I believe the reform will make all of us live and act in a different way. And not only creative workers, who are generally in favor of this and have wanted it for a long time. It will make everyone without exception "budge," so to speak; it will reveal the true cadre situation and sort out "who is who" fairly rapidly. This is a "plus" for the draft document which naturally looks like a "minus" to many people. And that, in fact, is what leads to opposition.

Obviously the reform will also reveal another fact: We do not have all that many writers and directors capable of tackling at a high standard the new tasks which life poses for our art. In fact, this is already becoming noticeable. We creative workers will have to take a new look at ourselves and reevaluate much in ourselves.

We must begin urgently to concern ourselves with the influx of young forces into the movie industry. Perhaps emergency measures are needed. I have in mind the expansion of courses for screenwriters and directors. People of a new kind are needed, people who are not only talented, but also bold and daring. We must remember, seek out, and find the graduates from recent years. Where are they? Many have wandered off, finding no outlet, into the vast spaces of Russia...

It will soon become clear to us that the movie industry's material and technical base is in no way appropriate to the scale of our intentions and the changes. How can there be real restructuring, given this state of affairs? We want to reach the world's screens and conquer them.

Of course, we cannot resolve these questions by ourselves, we hope for state assistance, and we request such assistance.

Questions connected with a new concept for us, that of the "creative reserve," require further work and clarification. The idea of the creative reserve as a formalized method, necessary to the movie industry, for organizing specialists' labor in the period between pictures did not spring up all at once. The logic of work under the financial autonomy principle first suggested the direct, preemptory conclusion--that specialists in all professions should be removed from the staff and then invited to do contract work as necessary. Incidentally, such projects were entertained for many a year.

But is the direct approach always the best? The existence of a reserve of specialists as a creative organization living a normal life in society and production, oriented toward preparation for the next jobs and constantly feeding the movie industry--that, I think is a better idea than thinking in terms of craftsmen sitting separately at home waiting for the next invitation.

Another question which arises in connection with the problem of the creative reserve is that of how and on what principle young forces will be incorporated into it.

We pin considerable hopes on the future cinema foundation. We count on using its potential not only in order to tackle questions of organization, construction, daily life, and so forth, but also in the creative sphere. If the union has confidence in a young artist (and not only a young one), why should it not support his debut, his experiment--support if financially, so as to lessen the degree of economic risk to the studio, or even take on this risk entirely?

But let us come back to the question of young people in relation to the new situation determined by our model. It seems to us that the future autonomous studios, in the quest for more interesting and unexpected productions than we have at present, will turn to young people: After all, not everything is a matter of financial calculations--for the studios, it should be a matter of prestige to find and discover new names and create pictures with high ideological and artistic qualities, innovative in their approach to problems and in their language.

And, lastly: Experience suggests that the numerous complaints from young people, "they don't let us do this," "they don't give us that," "they cut our work," and so forth, quite often turn out to be unconvincing on investigation: their plans are unoriginal, their projects banal, their ideas highly conformist...

And why is our VUZ diploma so often regarded as practically a legal entitlement to an independent production? That right still has to be earned and won. Besides, virtually no major foreign director started with his own production. Assistant, second director, even a member of another profession--that is how the most important masters often started. What is most important is, from the first, not to overlook talent, not to overlook those who are really able. I say these words now, and I remember how many times we have said them before. Let us back up these words with practical deeds.

Now let us turn from those who are just starting out to those on whom their fate largely depends. The studios' artistic leaders. A studio's artistic director (or the chairman of the board)--that is a special problem. Today it is hard even to imagine how that problem will be exacerbated in the near future. We must be clearly aware: Not all of the present leaders of associations will be able (or will want) to head the new creative organism. And by no means everyone who will take the risk and expresses the desire to do so is "up to" this complex role. The leader of tomorrow's studio is not only an artist of prestige (which goes without saying), but also a skilled organizer, a knowledgeable economic manager, and an experienced financier capable of taking on not a conditional or nominal responsibility, but the very real, difficult responsibility for the studio's entire productive and creative activity. Such people must be trained and taught.

One question which has not been reflected in detail in the new model for the movie industry is the actor problem. A number of aspects of this problem, especially contractual and legal aspects, were examined recently by the secretariat. They discussed drawing up documents which more reliably protect the actor's rights, improving working conditions for performers at all stages of work on a movie, and the question of a legally formulated system of mutually advantageous, reciprocally responsible relations between movie studios and theaters when theater actors are involved in filming.

I will touch on another aspect of the model, a matter on which I know questions and doubts will arise. It is the section of the draft document where it says that the distribution system has the right not to accept a movie for showing nationwide. To prevent this paragraph from becoming an opening for a new "shelf" to develop, it must be clearly stipulated that it refers only to movies of poor artistic quality, works which have failed, the real disasters. There is no point in spending money on publishing them, advertising them, showing them, and so forth--after all, this expenditure is often greater than the expenditure on making the movie!

Perhaps there is some sense in speeding up the creation of the All-Union Distribution Commission, so that it can start work sooner. No doubt it is already time we began evaluating movies in the new way, and the distribution, if only in certain cases to begin with, should start making use of its right not to release downright hackwork.

One of the most complex and delicate questions is that of the application of the principles of financial autonomy in small studios, mainly republican studios. This question arose as soon as the real outlines of the restructuring began to take shape. One thing is clear: To place a movie studio which produces a mere handful of movies in economic conditions identical to those which apply to the vast collectives and potential of the central studios is absolutely impossible. Equating everyone without taking account of peculiarities means deliberately pushing the majority of the republican studios to the brink of bankruptcy and disaster. There is no need to explain that our multinational cinema, which is unique and unparalleled, depends on the life and work of these studios, and not one fragment of that multinational cinema can or should be allowed to drop out of the picture.

But another thing is clear too. It is also impossible to leave the national movie industries in their former condition or place them outside the general system of the new movie industry. This is impermissible for the republican studios themselves. A version (or even versions) of the new economic approach must be found which will stimulate the creative potential of every one of them and raise the national cinema to a higher level.

It is clear to everyone that the restructuring of the movie industry will inevitably require a new, or rather, a radically new way of organizing screenwriting work at many levels--from consideration of the author's application to the adoption of the finished screenplay and then the movie. We still have to study this complex matter, even, perhaps, here at the plenum, in order to put it on a new footing.

Tremendous work lies ahead, and it will make us study new concepts and become more closely acquainted with the rudiments of economics, planning, management, statistics, law, accounting, sociology. There is no other way out. All this will be difficult and hard to do. But it must be done.

E. Klimov spoke of concrete measures to ensure the restructuring of the entire movie industry, with a view to freeing the filming collectives from petty tutelage, facilitating the passage of screenplays and finished movies, and creating new studios.

Our plenum is not a summing up of results, but a discussion of the first real steps toward reform, the speaker stressed.

The work that the Fifth Cinema Workers' Congress inspired us to do and that is now beginning to be put into practice is not a short-term campaign or a "cosmetic" operation designed to maintain good appearances in the next 3 months. We proceed on the basis of a real, substantial restructuring of work and relations, including our own, most difficult restructuring--the inner, profound, creative restructuring of our way of thinking. Only then will the preconditions be achieved and realized for a civic art, an honest art, the art that people really need. It is this art that the creative union should concern itself with above all.

CULTURE

PRAVDA REVIEWS ABULADZE MOVIE 'REPENTANCE'

PM091042 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 February 1987 first edition carries on page 3 under the heading "Uprooting Evil" a 2,100-word review by Georgiy Kapralov of Tengiz Abuladze's movie "Repentance." Most of Kapralov's review consists of telling the story of the movie and describing the central characters and events, with detailed accounts of key scenes. Kapralov describes the movie as a "parable," and defends it against some viewers' criticism of the suicide of Tornike, one of the central characters, by pointing out that "according to the logic of a parable, this is by no means an assertion that there is no other solution to the conflict." He claims that the movie has "tremendous artistic wealth," adding: "The exposure of evil, which destroys not only the world around it, but itself, turning reality into absurdity and nightmare, sowing death and increasing suffering, is presented on the screen now in its real features, now in images of tragic symbolism, now in sinister, grotesque, fantastic, even surrealistic images." Kapralov concludes: "Revolutionary processes are taking place in our country today. The people's high ideals of humanism, democracy, and truly socialist renewal inspire the party and all the people. And the movie 'Repentance' is a sign of the times, one of many proofs of the changes for the better taking place in the country. It is in itself an instance of the moral cleansing of society, of courageous openness."

/12858

CSO: 1800/334

CULTURE

'REPENTANCE' POINTS UP NEED FOR 'MORAL-REVOLUTIONARY RENEWAL'

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 18 October 1986 carries on page 3 Niko Chavchavadze's 1,000-word review of Tengiz Abuladze's film "Repentance" [Georgian 'Monanieba', Russian 'Pokayaniye'] which has already had quite an impact on viewers. The reviewer does not go into the plot or its characters, although an appended photo of one frame shows the central character, Varlam, standing in an open vehicle in demagogic pose, and states that it is "not localized in time and space." Chavchavadze's main emphasis is on the film's social and ethical worth. The film shows most persuasively that "man must be the end, not the means" of social progress, that "philanthropic ideals cannot be achieved by misanthropic means," and as the poet says, "all progress is reactionary if man is broken." Above all, "repentance is the prerequisite to moral rebirth."

The reviewer recalls a time when the arts were dominated by "the theory of non-conflict," meaning that because class antagonisms had been done away with, art should not depict social conflicts. This was not only false, but those who propounded it were well aware it was false; hence, they were "teaching lies and duplicity." Similarly, correct Marxist tenets of morality became "vulgarized dogmas" interpreted as if there were no absolute, eternal moral values.

Although these dogmas are gone, "much remains to be overcome." The film "Repentance" shows great horrors but kindles "faith in absolute moral ideals." Now that "our country and all humanity" are in need of "moral-revolutionary renewal," this film is a remarkable example of the new way of thinking and "cleansed moral consciousness."

NORWEGIAN EXPERT ON GEORGIAN LANGUAGE EULOGIZED

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 23 October 1986 carries on page 4 Ioseb Megrelidze's 400-word article sketching the life and works of the late Hans Vogt, the internationally renowned Norwegian Kartvelologist [scholar in Georgian studies] who did much to study and popularize Georgian and other Caucasian languages. News of Vogt's death is actually dated 2 September. As a young linguist, Vogt studied the classical and modern European languages, then took up Armenian and Georgian, the latter in Georgia in 1932-33. In addition to thorough grammatical studies of Georgian [all in French], Vogt published numerous articles on phonology and morphology as well as Georgian relationships with Armenian, the other Caucasian languages, and Basque. In the late 1950s and early 1960s he

published important works on the nearly extinct language of the Ubykhs--a Caucasian people who emigrated [wholesale in the 19th century] to Turkey. Hans Vogt was an honorary professor of Tbilisi State University, member of the Norwegian and Danish academies of sciences, and other prestigious organizations. In 1964-1967 he served as rector of Oslo University.

MAKER OF 'REPENTANCE' LAUDED FOR COURAGE TO 'TELL PAINFUL TRUTH'

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi LITERATURULI SAKARTVELO [Literary Georgia] in Georgian No 44, 31 October 1986 carries on pages 11-12 prominent writer Revaz Dzhaparidze's 4,700-word review of "Repentance," the film which has been packing theaters and creating long waiting lines of persons hungry for "spiritual nourishment" rather than "mere entertainment...or pseudohistorical drama." The reviewer praises Tengiz Abuladze, who made the film, for the courage to "look deep into our own people's [rodnogo naroda] recent past" and "tell the truth of enormous social pain." Although it has "the accuracy of a documentary," the film is not a depiction of actual individuals or events, for that would "deprive it of universality."

Reviewer Dzhaparidze refrains from recounting the plot but does sketch a number of the key scenes and turning points and, in particular, repeatedly emphasizes the monstrous cynicism and power-lust of Varlam [the central character] and his cronies, who crush people and make life a living hell for innocent persons labeled as enemies, reactionaries in the path of progress toward "happiness for all humankind"--in short, all whose vision is different from Varlam's, who "have national feelings." The law, "all power over life and death," is in Varlam's hands.

Among the scenes examined in some detail are the fateful confrontation-argument between Varlam's son Abel and grandson Tornike which leads to the latter's suicide out of guilt for his grandfather's sins; the Inquisition-like allegory in which Varlam's thugs round up suspected persons for questioning, courteously intoning "Aka Mshvidoba" [Peace Here] as they enter each house; and the monstrously absurd "trial" as Themis, the Goddess of Justice, looks benignly on.

'REPENTANCE' REVEALS NATURE OF 'TOTALITARIANISM'

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 4 November 1986 carries on page 4 a 4,000-word piece by Archil Gogelia incorporating an interview with Tengiz Abuladze, the maker of "Repentance," and exploring the themes and meanings of that widely acclaimed film. It is noted in passing that KOMUNISTI intends to publish more reviews and commentary on this sensational cultural event, in particular a piece by Professor Nodar Kakabadze, in the near future.

A recurrent point that is emphasized is that young people, who have most whole-heartedly accepted the film, are precisely those whose "moral maximalism" may be counted on finally to eradicate the evil of "Varlamism" [so called after the name of the film's central character]. Among the older

generation, especially those who hold to "outmoded stances," reaction has been more mixed: some deem it "unnecessarily explicit," and others (both viewers and certain characters in the film) plead in justification of past excesses that "those were different times." Brief reference is made as well to "technical and organizational barriers," also "thorns strewn in the path" by unnamed persons, that threatened to block realization of the film. There have been some objections, as well, to the film's use of explicitly Biblical symbols and themes which the reviewer justifies by reference to the necessary resurgence of "moral maximalism." In any case, overall public acceptance reflects the maturity of today's audiences in the context of on-going "moral cleansing, psychological restructuring, expanded democracy, and the new openness."

The most heavily emphasized theme in the article is the nature of "Varlamism" both in the past and in its later, evolved forms, and the need to eradicate it. Although the "composite" characters of the film "greatly resemble" persons and events everyone is aware of (none are named), the film maker deliberately refrained from "concretizing" them in order to render the work more universal and generalized. "Varlamism" is perpetrated by those who, in the name of pseudodemocracy and the security of the state, wield terrible power and commit monstrous acts against their people. The horror of "totalitarianism" is that it destroys people physically and emasculates them spiritually, so that decent people are reduced to groveling at the feet of evil in desperate hope of obtaining justice. This evil has plagued mankind through the centuries, from Ancient Rome, through Mussolini and Hitler, and (to take one example) Pinochet today. Gorbachev is quoted to the effect that if a system hurts people, that system is bad.

In its later form, "Varlamism" has been masked and refined by its demagogic, philistine inheritors, who stick together in defense of their power and privileges. Although not guilty of the same kinds of excesses perpetrated in the past, they do exercise the law for their own ends, and "the film shows us that although the events of the past are never repeated automatically [mekhanicheskii], it behooves us to be all the more watchful...lest legality [zakonnost] disintegrate and be left to the philistines to do with as they will." As one historian has put it, "history is created and written to serve as an instructive lesson to those who come after."

GEORGIAN BRANCH OF 'CULTURE FUND' TO HAVE 'CONSIDERABLE LEEWAY'

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 24 November 1986 carries on page 3 a 1,500-word KOMUNISTI interview with Professor Tengiz Buachidze, the "distinguished writer, scholar, and public figure" who took part in the 12 November conference in Moscow that created the Soviet Culture Fund. Professor Buachadze, who has enjoyed long acquaintance and collaboration with the Fund's newly-elected chairman Academician Dmitriy Likhachev, was himself elected a member of the Board.

Buachidze states that the creation of the Fund and its Charter means that "leaders now believe a new stage has been reached, in which large social

organizations can go about the job of gathering, assimilating, and utilizing components of national culture without bureaucratic intervention and petty tutelage." Not that intellectuals and persons in the arts have themselves been blameless for "poor organization, failure to bring out novel ways of thinking and utilizing the collective's potential." After all, "we are responsible not only for what is and what will be, but for what has been." Buachidze places these considerations in the context of "moral cleansing, restructuring, and acceleration."

Branches ("departments") are to be created in all the republics and a few large cities and oblasts, and will abide by the central Charter. Professor Buachidze himself spoke out emphatically at the conference on the need for the branches to have "reasonable autonomy and authority." The new Soviet culture cannot be formed unless national culture is permitted to flourish. "Random, unthinking leveling of national culture leads to impoverishment of the whole." Hence, the Georgian branch will enjoy considerable leeway--within, of course, the framework of the "interests of all the people."

Buachidze sketches a few of the Fund's goals: To ensure that the high accomplishments of culture are made accessible to the masses, without, however, allowing "mass culture" to intrude and lead to "low ideals and esthetic decline." More people and groups need to become involved. World and native monuments of culture must be made available. Efforts must be made to retrieve important works of national art, archives, manuscripts, and other monuments from abroad.

The Fund is to be self-supporting--through donations, bequests, contributions by the creative unions and other organizations, proceeds from publications and other operations, auctions and lotteries, exhibits, and so on.

6854

CSO: 1830/256

CULTURE

KAZAKH WRITERS UNION FORUM ON INTERNATIONALISM

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata QAZAQ ADEBIYETI in Kazakh on 5 December carries on pages 2-4 a 5,900-word report of a Kazakhstan Writers Union forum on internationalism in the KaSSR entitled "Internationalism and the Multi-Ethnic Literature of Kazakhstan." The report reproduces an abridged version of the keynote address of A. Shimov, secretary of the Kazakhstan Writer's Union, along with comments by others in response to the Shimov address.

Shimov largely repeated in his speech standard themes about the value of internationalism and the achievements of the various literatures of the KaSSR under conditions of an official encouraged internationalist interaction. There were, however, notes of discordance heard in the comments of others, following the Shimov speech.

Most notably, I.P. Shchegolikin, chief of the Writer's Union Council for Russian Literature, took a grave view of what he has seen as a recent decline in internationalist values among the people of the KaSSR, the population of Alma-Ata in particular. There, according to Shchegolikin, each ethnic group now tends to pursue its own culturally particularist aims. He attributes this decline of what he would suggest as old internationalist virtues as due to "ignorance of language," failure by the authorities to push internationalist values sufficiently and ethnic chauvinism.

Other criticisms were offered by KaSSR German writer Gerol'd Bel'ger, who complained about a too narrow view of republic internationalism in terms of Russian-Kazakh juxtaposition (whereas, he noted, there are many other ethnic groups present in the republic which should be represented in literature as well), and generally regarding the poor quality of translated works. Many writers, one respondent noted, have not received their due due to poor translations of their work. Also subject of complaint is the often poor selection of translated materials. In this latter connection the ZHALYN Literary Almanac was singled out for publishing too little of the Russian language work of republic writers in Kazakh versions (the ZHALYN Almanac will, however, soon be publishing a Kazakh version of the latest Aytmatov novel, as one contribution of internationalism).

/12858

CSO: 1832/412

SOCIAL ISSUES

MOSCOW TV: SUPREME COURT CHAIRMAN ON OPENNESS IN LAW

LD250349 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1640 GMT 23 Jan 87

["Justice and Conscience" program; interview with Vladimir Ivanovich Terebilov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, by journalist Rostislav Andreyev; date, place not specified--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Andreyev] Vladimir Ivanovich, the recently adopted decision by the CPSU Central Committee on the further strengthening of socialist legality, law and order, and on stepping up the safeguarding of citizens' rights and lawful interests--the second part of that decision seeming to me to be symptomatic at the present time--that decision says clearly that our law enforcement bodies, including the judicial bodies, must restructure their work. My first question to you, therefore, is: How do you see the ways and forms of restructuring your work?

[Terebilov] Well, to give a very brief and simplified reply to that question, I would say first of all that in all the official departments, restructuring should go principally along the lines of some sort of organizational rearrangement, changes or divisions. I would name four or five chief directions of restructuring.

The first task and the first sign of restructuring is to get rid of as many as possible of the judicial mistakes that are regrettably still occurring; and first and foremost to eliminate resolutely all transgressions of the law within the judicial system itself. That is the first and the most important direction.

Second, I think that the court system in our country will be developing in the future, if we look at the long term, primarily through the greater participation of the public; not the quantity of the public who are involved in carrying out some sort of legal functions, but I would say, the quality of that participation--more active, more rational and sensible participation. After all, we have a very large amount of public participation in law and order work. Just as a reminder, there are 10 million people working in the People's Control bodies; there are 800,000 people's assessors; there are the volunteer militia groups; I could name dozens of commissions--administrative commissions, observer commissions, commissions for the affairs of minors, commissions to fight drunkenness--it's

a colossal aktiv. So I think that this further development should take place not by an expansion, but chiefly by regulating the work of these public units, making it more active and effective. So it is clear to me that this is the second direction in restructuring the work of the courts. If you want to raise any queries, I will give a more specific answer, but meanwhile I shall continue in brief.

Third, I think that we have to agree with the mass media and considerably improve the openness of law and order activity. I think this is a weak spot, and that openness will undoubtedly help solve the overall tasks of safeguarding citizens' rights and maintaining law and order. It will also help the law enforcement bodies themselves enhance the level of their work. So that's the third point.

The fourth I would call the qualitative restructuring of the link between law enforcement bodies and science. This would not simply be the traditional meetings with scientists to discuss individual complex questions--necessary those these still are. But the idea that I would put forward in particular is this. Sociological research in our country is lagging very far behind, and I think that the weakness of our law enforcement work, its shortcomings, can be partially explained by the fact that it is not based on truly scientific, profound, objective sociological research--without which, of course, it is very difficult to define the chief directions of law enforcement work, and if you like, to assess what has to be paid more attention to and what has to be solved urgently.

So those, perhaps, are the four directions that I would list. However, since our meeting today is also an exercise in restructuring, whereby you refused to give me the questions beforehand, [both chuckle], my answers perhaps haven't been complete. But anyway, those are the four chief directions. Perhaps as we go on I shall add something else that I have left out.

[Andreyev] Well, I would like to touch on the question of the authority of the court, of respect for the court. After all, in recent years--and we journalists have been observing this--the authority of the court has fallen somewhat. There are many factors at work here, of course, but I would like to ask you to discuss one of them. Respect for the court to my mind depends largely on the personality of the judicial officers, from the people's judges down to the ordinary court bailiffs. In recent years their environment has been penetrated by the germs of toadying, subservience and bribery, and this of course contradicts the very idea of legal proceedings and the purity of law enforcement bodies. How do you think these phenomena should be fought against, and what in practise is being done along these lines?

[Terebilov] Well, I perhaps won't be 100 percent objective. It's difficult for me at least to agree even with the way you have put the question: I have worked for 47 years in the justice organizations, and I

have no greatly higher opinion than the one you expressed. Although to put it bluntly, of course, one would regrettably like the authority of the justice bodies to be considerably higher than it is now. What I can agree with you on is that this depends first and foremost on the judges themselves, on what they are like from the point of view both of their professional and their moral qualities, and of course the political level of the judge's work and the personality of the judge himself. That is indubitable.

However, I would like to take this opportunity to put to you, among others, some claims in response. I think that to some degree, in those instances where you think that the authoritativeness of justice is not at the level it should be, this is the fault of certain control bodies, certain bodies of power and, if you like, the mass media. Where do I see this? Well, it's difficult for me right now, off the cuff, to draw a parallel, but what I would say is this. You will notice that certain members of the aktiv, and even leading comrades, consider it shameful to go to court and give evidence. Quite a haughty attitude, if you like, to the court. To call a person of some position as a witness is not always easy. I see this happening, and unfortunately judges are beginning to get used to it: They are reconciling themselves to it. In that respect I agree with you. They are getting used to the fact these people don't come; at best they send someone else, or else they avoid the thing completely.

I think that judges are definitely not always persistent in ensuring that the ruling they make are carried out. The judges' special rulings that people always talk a lot about...

[Andreyev interrupts] Excuse me. I think everyone's talking about those.

[Terebilov] Yes, and the trouble is that the legislation was not formulated clearly and well enough. It gave the court the right to hand down these special rulings, but did not define the consequences of not carrying them out. I am a little powerless to do anything in this regard.

I think that certain judges, of course, don't have enough civic spirit, or civic courage to stand up to certain pressures. I think there are judges who make rulings and then sit wondering what the procurator will think and say about it, what the chairman of the ispolkom will think, what the secretary of the raykom will think, or what someone else may think about it. Of course this shortcoming does exist. But at the same time I would like to state categorically that I cannot agree that a large number of judges are infected with this sickness, if it may be so called.

[Andreyev] No, we're not talking about the majority, of course.

[Terebilov] Well, all the same. Let me quote you this figure: Four to 5 percent of court rulings in criminal cases are subsequently subjected to substantial variation; 95 percent of the rulings made remain in force.

Even if you say that some shortcomings are never discovered and incorrect judgments remain in force, then all right, let it be 6 percent. But even so, 94 percent of the rulings are correct. And in civil suits, some 98 or 99 percent of the rulings are not subsequently subjected to any variation. So I would like to stand up for the judges here, and say that of course there are very serious shortcomings which I am aware of myself: It's simply that [words indistinct] how these questions are solved. Nevertheless they are, of course, the minority, and I would very much like the mass media not to support the bad judges, but to show the good judges and give them credit for their very complex work--work which is, most importantly, very necessary to the state.

[Andreyev] Well, I don't think that the mass media have ever supported bad judges. On the contrary, we criticize them, so here we are trying in fact to help you get rid of this.

[Andreyev] Now I would like to speak about openness. You said that this is one direction, and when you said that only 4 or 5 percent of criminal cases are reviewed--in other words mistakes are made in these instances--and when you said that you knew the statistics, well I, unfortunately, don't know the statistics. And I only suspect--I'm guessing--that behind those 4 or 5 percent there are very many human destinies--probably several thousands, to put it mildly, or maybe far more. So how do you understand, how do you imagine the expansion of openness in legal proceedings?

[Terebilov] I think that your suggestion is completely correct. I think that this openness ought to begin with making court statistics not only official, but publishing them for the whole population. What form it may take is difficult for me to say, but I have my own point of view: I think that on 1 January each year, let us say, the Ministry of Justice would have to inform, in essence, all citizens about the main indicators characterizing the dynamics of crime rate for the past year, the dynamics of work done by the judiciary for the past year. Apparently it would be possible to select some definite indicators and use them on a periodic basis, annually, to be able to compare them. I think this is possible, I think it is a possible and useful thing. It is of equal usefulness both to the aktiv which would be able to render greater help to the law protection bodies in solving such complex tasks; and it would, naturally, compel the law protection bodies to do better work. Openness will, undoubtedly, have a positive influence on the quality of work. This is one element.

Apparently most law protection bodies in our country do not currently have regular and, I would say, regulated ties with mass information media. The establishment of some form of press groups within law protection bodies, charged with providing systematic and precisely correct and objective information for our press, radio and the television about the main aspects of their work, would probably also be very useful.

I would argue in favor of instituting and publishing a special juridical newspaper. All respect for any newspaper notwithstanding, why is it that, for instance, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA prints questions that are purely juridical? I think this is the case because there is no other similar organ that would do this. This paper has taken this mission on itself. It would be necessary for a special paper to be printed. I am in favor of organizing, for instance, a Union of Jurists, to unite jurists from various departments with one main purpose in mind: The propagation of the law and providing legal education for the citizens. Moreover, this legal education for the citizens would not only be based on learning by heart some juridical norms which, incidentally, is a major error I encounter and, incidentally, my acquaintances ask me at home: Do you know what this or that article is all about, do you know what some other article is all about? I say I do not know or imagine, I do not know, nor do I learn these things by heart, since legal education does not revolve around knowing this or that article by heart; rather, it consists in making the moral and ethical aspects of these norms your guide, in recognizing them as the norm of your conduct. It is in this that legal education consists.

Things currently need to be corrected precisely in this direction, since--and here I have to ask to be excused for using what may appear to be a crude word--but the villain also studies legal norms, but he studies them to be able to use them in trying to escape responsibility. But what we need is that people should study them from inner needs--to know the moral and ethical norms implicit in the juridical norms and which should become the second nature [word indistinct], the inner content of the way of thinking of such a person, his views on life. In this respect I also see the entire population getting a broader knowledge of what the law protection bodies are doing.

[Terebilov continues] Another thing is said: Your sentencing policy is weak, punishment is small, not as it should be; it is necessary to pass more severe sentences. This is commonplace. If you listen to some people and even some speeches you would end up believing that ours is some kind of liberal convention. This is completely untrue. Ours is a harsh sentencing practice. We apply very strict sentences in comparison to other countries, including the socialist countries. You will not find many countries that have such harsh sentences as we do.

I think differently. I think that we put too much value in harsh sentencing. And it would be correct--there is now an instruction of this kind for the year 1987--to take a look at our legislation: Is it essential to retain some excessively harsh measures of punishment concerning individual types of less dangerous crimes? The problem of combating crime can never be solved through harsher sentencing alone. Prevention is, all the same, the main thing. Well, this idea must also be brought home to the population, because it is only when citizens have come to understand this idea and to support it that we will be able to entertain the thought that we will solve considerably more important and fundamental problems of combating violations of the law and crimes, in particular.

[Andreyev] Vladimir Ivanovich, this subject you have just touched upon, concerning demands for harsher sentencing for lawbreakers, is one that is very close to my heart, because our "Man and the Law" television program receives an enormous number of letters. Most of them, probably 90 percent of reactions to broadcasts which featured some legal proceedings, reflect disagreement with the court's decision. We demand harsher sentencing; where that comes from, I do not understand. Generally harshness is not a Russian characteristic; after all, kindness is our national trait. Why then is this the case, and you have just confirmed this observation?

[Terebilov] Recently I received in my office a young man, well, not so young a middle-aged man. He says his sentence was incorrect. What was it for? I completed a trade institute and was sent for a probationary period to a shop selling radio and television sets. I was put under a section head, an experienced man. He said: As a probationer--he was sent for 6 months, prior to getting the job and after completing the trade institute--as a probationer, I will put you in the credit sales of television sets, but remember, you can go right ahead and ask each of those who buys a set from you for R50. I do likewise and everyone here already knows that this is the going rate, have no doubt. That is to say, to rob everyone of R50. And he agreed to this. He received R350 from seven people. I say to him, you committed a crime? Yes, I did. Did you return the money? They took the money from me right away. How long did you work? One-and-a-half months. What was the period provided for in your sentence? Eight years deprivation of liberty.

I do not know what your opinion would be, but this punishment appeared harsh to me. But, unfortunately, I asked him what he would regard as a just punishment? And he says: It was possible to not punish me altogether, I already showed repentance and all that. Well, what can I now do for you? He says: There is nothing you can do, I have already completed my sentence and I came to you after completing it.

So this case went through five courts, five procurators, and no one reacted to this situation. So you see, we have the same point of view here. I think that harshness is not necessary against a young man who has just left a higher educational establishment and has been working just over a month. And [words indistinct] I can, unfortunately, name many more such facts for you, facts that are perhaps even more controversial. If you go into this a bit deeper, it is surely no less dangerous than when we fail to punish the criminal.

[Andreyev] All the same, the torrent of demands and proposals of this kind can, it seems to me, be explained by the fact that we have seen too much impunity. When proceedings featuring these bribe takers and people guilty of misappropriations are shown, then it is natural that people should vent all their pent up malice that they feel toward others, other people, on them.

[Terebilov] In the end I would answer your question like this: I do not deny that individual cases like that do take place. But speaking about the overall situation I see the other side; I am more worried about our being too severe in our punishment and deluding ourselves, believing that we will thereby rectify things.

[Andreyev] You know, I found the question interesting, too, since the practice of giving 3 or 4 months' deprivation of liberty as a punishment has ceased. And so we asked the question. Let's look at the answer given by the judges to this question:

[Begin recording of Andreyev video interview with a group of judges]
Valentina Vasilyevna, I want to ask you, have you recently--say during the past 6 months--passed any sentence that has been restricted to punishment lasting several months? As far as criminal cases are concerned?

[V.V. Sterlyakhina, identified by caption as People's Judge] No, I have not had occasion to. We, I, in particular, consider that a punishment that lasts for several months' deprivation of liberty is no punishment--it will be in keeping neither with correction nor reeducation. Naturally, therefore, if the law provides for an alternative punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for several months, going up to a year, even, or something else in the form of corrective labor or any other punishment, then of course the court, with due consideration for the personality of the accused, will approach it not with a view of fixing a punishment of several months' deprivation of liberty, but a different one which will be more effective for the reeducation of the individual in question. [end recording]

[Andreyev] There, Vladimir Ivanovich, the judge is opposed to making sentences lighter.

[Terebilov] I listened to her carefully and I do not think that she expressed her thoughts very clearly. This is what it's about: If she wanted to say--and I suspect that this is precisely what she wanted to say--that instead of giving, say, 6 months deprivation of liberty it would be better to give him 6 months' correction labor--in other words a lighter punishment--then one can agree with her, if the individual is one who can be corrected without deprivation of liberty. But if her reply is to be understood to mean that 6 months of deprivation of liberty, 9 months of deprivation of liberty, even 1 year are not punishments, then I don't think that it is possible to agree with her.

[Andreyev] I didn't agree with her. What she said was this. She says that they do not manage to reeducate the person concerned.

[Terebilov] I think it would be very easy to change her mind. She would be asked whether it is possible for someone to be reeducated over a 13-month period but not over a year. That's naive thinking. I think that everything depends upon the nature of the crime and the personality of the criminal. For some people even 6 months' deprivation of liberty is a very

severe punishment that will fulfill both the role of punishment and the role of reeducation. He will remember it for the whole of his life. And for some people even 3 years will not be enough for the person concerned to draw serious lessons from the punishment. I believe, therefore, that the existing system, which also makes it possible to fix short periods of punishment, does have the right to exist; it is necessary for certain individuals and for certain types of crimes. In cases where one can avoid resorting to deprivation of liberty, then of course one must avoid it. As far as that is concerned--if it's possible to understand her that way--I am fully in agreement with her. But if one takes the other position, that one cannot do so in any circumstances, I fear that this will push the judges in the other direction, and they will be giving sentences not of 9 months and 1 year, but of 2 and 3 years. I think, therefore, that the law currently in operation should be maintained; perhaps it should be leveled out in places, but it seems to me that if it is going to be leveled out, this should be through renouncing deprivation of liberty in appropriate cases and replacing it with other measures of punishment that do not entail deprivation of liberty.

[Andreyev] You know, Vladimir Ivanovich, here I must say that we journalists deserve a rebuke because we very, very rarely describe--it is very, very rare for it to be shown on television, and it's rarely written about even in the newspapers--the conditions in which prisoners find themselves, that is to say people who have been deprived of their liberty. This loss of liberty is a dreadful condition to be in, yet many people have no idea of what it means. And of course 3 months even--not just in the colony, there, whatever the regime, but in solitary confinement even during investigation--this itself is a very severe punishment.

[Terebilov] I think that for any person deprivation of liberty for whatever period is a very serious punishment, a very serious punishment; there are no differences between us on this.

[Andreyev] The question of the quality of the investigation is also touched on here.

[Begin Sterlyakhina recording] Our work is difficult. Why do we say that our work is difficult? Why are judges afraid of giving acquittals?, for that really is the case. It is indeed. Well, why? First of all, I think there are two reasons that are the most obvious. First of all the poor quality of the investigation that has been carried out; the judge therefore is in difficulty. The court, in particular, is in difficulty about delivering either a conviction or an acquittal. Why? Many cases we deal with are sent for additional investigation. Sometimes we send cases for further investigation not because we are unable to deliver an acquittal, but simply because the preliminary investigation has been badly carried out. Undoubtedly a great deal has to be said at great length and in specific terms about questions concerning improving the quality of investigation. Why? Because sometimes our investigations are carried out by people who are not very competent. Perhaps because of the heavy work load carried by

investigators and investigation departments they very often reallocate investigation work of one kind of another to be done by interrogation officers and station inspectors; all evidence in some particular case or other is therefore lost, evidence which if it were used in a certain way could serve as very good evidence for delivering either a guilty verdict or an acquittal. [end recording]

[Andreyev] Couldn't you tell me what is the percentage of all cases that end in verdicts of not guilty?

[Terebilov] There are several hundred verdicts of not guilty each year throughout the Soviet Union. But here I must make the following point, although it will be rather complicated. Let me ask you to go back to what Lenin said about this question. He said that there must not be any fear of the court. And that in cases where things are very complex and in dispute, well, let's go to the court and straighten it out. And so he says there is a place--and you will remember this--for me to be cleared: Where I insist on it, put the material before the court, and demand a trial. This figure, of course, say 200 or 300 or 400 people are going to be put on trial without sufficient grounds, but for some reason we see only one side. We do not see the other side, the fact that they have been rehabilitated and it is possible even that some of them would have insisted on this.

There is another complex problem, too, and here it is not just the investigators who are to blame. Of course the quality of investigation is not high. But our law raises the issue in these terms: The investigation is a preliminary investigation, and the court must not deliver a verdict on the basis of this material. Only investigation material which has been tested in court and which has been confirmed in court--in court, note--can serve as the basis for bringing in a verdict. The same thought was to be discerned in what this judge said. The investigator has sent in the evidence; she herself does not believe the evidence but she cannot bring herself to bring in an acquittal. This is a weakness on the part of some of our judges; you have, so to speak, brought me one of the judges to see for myself. The decision here has to be taken quite firmly: If the information presented by the investigation has not been confirmed in court, then a verdict of not guilty has to be brought in. In isolated instances the case has to be sent back for further investigation in order not to release some serious criminal in the absence of exhaustive information about his guilt. [Passage omitted: In a recording, Moscow lawyers express the view that suspects should have access to a lawyer at an earlier stage than at present--at the moment of arrest]

[Terebilov] I fully agree that the period or, rather the point in time, when a lawyer enters a criminal case must be changed. At the moment, as a general rule, the lawyer joins the case at the end of the preliminary investigation, or, with the permission of the public prosecutor, as one of the lawyers said earlier, he can join the case when charges are brought. I believe that preconditions already exist to justify the introduction of a procedure whereby the accused can, if under arrest, demand the involvement

of a lawyer from the moment charges are brought. A proposal has been made to involve the lawyer even earlier, from the moment of arrest. But it seems to me to be rather early for this. This could be something for the future. But at the moment I think there is no need to have a lawyer at a time when charges have not yet been brought and the charges have not been fully formulated by the investigating officials.

[Andreyev] We've also touched on the quality of the investigation. I want to ask the following question. In our system at present, the preliminary investigation is in the hands of two departments, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Public Prosecutor's Office. How do you regard the fact that the preliminary investigation is conducted by the procurator's office which ought to be supervising this process? How is it that it both carries out the investigation and supervises it?

[Terebilov] Naturally, I also believe that sooner or later the prosecutor's office and its investigative machinery must be separated. But the majority of procuracy workers--the majority, but not all--believe that the time for this has not arrived, although it seems to me that this reform could be introduced, and that one could set up investigative machinery attached to the Council of Ministers, attached to the Ministry of Justice.

[Andreyev] Vladimir Ivanovich, comments and reactions have already appeared in the press to the plenum held by the USSR Supreme Court from 2 to 5 December. I understand that the plenum was your response, to to speak, to the decision of the Central Committee. From what I read I gathered that, by and large, the newspapers responded very positively to the plenum, to the fact that openness dominated there, that justice triumphed in the conference hall where the plenum proceedings took place. All this is very good. Regrettably, I could not attend the plenum and sample the atmosphere, but I looked at the plenum decision and it somehow did not evoke a feeling of complete satisfaction as far as I was concerned, if I can put it that way. It lists a large number of things known from the very beginning. I'd like to ask you to explain and comment on why you did not take any fundamental decisions testifying to restructuring, but, by and large, confined yourselves to demanding that the judges strictly put into effect what they already knew.

[Terebilov] I believe that as in any field, the law should not try to reinvent the wheel if it already exists. The root of the errors that are still being made and that you and I have been talking about today lies in the fact that in a number of instances deviations from the principles of socialist justice are taking place. The plenum confirmed that neither any specific conditions nor any mythical interests of state in any way cancel out the operation of those principles. It confirmed that they remain fully in force and that the actual nature of the mistakes lies in the fact that the courts are not fulfilling, or are not fulfilling completely, or adhering to, these principles.

For example, and I can't remember it all, but for example: We think that a large number of mistakes, or the greater part of the mistakes, could be forestalled if the courts carried out the so-called stage of a preparatory sitting properly. Another thing that we recorded quite clearly yet again: The court does not have the right to hand down sentences on the basis of materials from the preliminary investigation. Only evidence verified directly by the court can be the basis for handing down a sentence. In no instance can reference be made to evidence obtained at the preliminary investigation but which was not confirmed in court. You have probably heard, and still hear of court sentences which say that at the preliminary investigation he admitted his guilt.

[Andreyev] Yes, that happens.

[Terebilov] That is not proof; it has to be confirmed in the court, directly or indirectly. The person may disclaim it, and it then has to be confirmed by direct or indirect evidence. But that should not happen. Or take another idea. Since the opinion of the public prosecutor and the investigator are preliminary opinions and are the opinions of those organs, that opinion is not, by nature, justice. The court cannot be connected both with the findings and with the claims. Only the judge is responsible for the sentence. The public prosecutor may put forward one point of view, the lawyer another point of view, and the investigator in his indictment another, but justice is dispensed by the court alone. So you have to make your ruling independent of the opinions of these other persons taking part in the trial, and only you bear the responsibility for the sentence. To put it into ordinary language, don't refer to what the public prosecutor asked for, don't refer to what the investigator wrote, and don't refer to what the lawyer has convinced you of. It is only you who makes the decision after going alone into your chambers and deciding in a calm atmosphere, unhurried and weighing everything up, and no one else but you will be responsible.

So if you look at our resolution from that aspect, it is aimed at one thing: To instill in judges the most important thing, the thing that you and I started with--you are independent, you are subordinate only to the law, and you alone therefore bear the responsibility for the sentence handed down. All the rest is just auxiliary material for you. Well, to what extent we have managed to do this successfully, it's difficult for me to say; you will be able to see better than me. But I think that this resolution will play a positive role.

And one other thing. I would like to point out that we are not a body of control over the courts. The Ministry of Justice can write that Judge Petrov, for example, commits errors, or whatever. We, however, have only one right: To interpret how the law is applied. We have prepared proposals that amendments be made to the law on the USSR Supreme Court. These have not yet been examined. The time for them to be submitted has not yet expired, but they will be examined. What I will do, therefore, is limit myself to saying in general terms what the proposals are about.

First of all, if you consider that our Supreme Court is a special court, and that a republican Supreme Court, for example the RSFSR Supreme Court, examines thousands of cases, we examine only a small number of cases. As a trial court we examine some 20 cases a year. These are the most important cases.

[Andreyev] Cases of particular complexity.

[Terebilov] Cases of particular complexity and particular importance. You probably know this, but just to remind you I recall that last year we tried the cases of the deputy chairman of the Moldavian Council of Ministers, the RSFSR Minister of Light Industry, the USSR Deputy Minister of Agricultural Machine-Building, and so on. We also try cases of a different kind connected with secrets of state, military secrets and so forth. So our most important work is to try these most important cases. Second in importance is our work to give the courts interpretations of how one law or another is to be understood, so as to achieve a uniform understanding of the law everywhere. Third, we examine appeals against cases tried by the supreme courts of the union republics. And finally we try all the cases where capital punishment is applicable. If you add up all these cases, you get quite a large number. Essentially we have 11 judges, and they examine, if you add everything together, roughly a little over 1,000 cases a year.

To make a serious change in this respect you have to change the whole structure and the volume. So we submitted a proposal of a different kind for enhancing the role, so to speak, of the Supreme Court. We would like the Supreme Court to have some of the functions of a so-called constitutional court. That's the direction we would like to take. We would like to be given the right to try cases of unlawful acts by union ministers. We would like to be given the right to try cases and submissions against enactments which encroach on citizens' rights. That is the direction: Not the usual direction of work that we take in an ordinary court of cases, cases and more cases, but the direction of individual functions that at present we do not have. And it would seem to us that in a state such as ours, the Supreme Court could also be given these powers.

[Andreyev] What we have been saying in our conversation suggests that many issues could be solved with the adoption of a law, a special law, governing respect for the court. What is your attitude toward this?

[Terebilov] If we had support in this regard, I am greatly in favor of having such a law. It seems to me that it is essential, a law that would establish the liability of people who try in one way or another to put pressure on the court or to deal with it with contempt, for that too is essentially one form of putting pressure on a court. And it is essential that they should bear the liability for violating the order in the court, for failing to carry out individual decisions, and a whole range of such things. It seems to me that we need such a law. I do not believe that

we will make widespread use of it, but the very fact that it exists and that it can be used in case of necessity would be helpful, I feel, not simply as far as the court's authority is concerned, but I think that this would raise the quality of our justice. Such a law is needed I think.

[Andreyev] Well, thank you for the conversation and in conclusion I would like to wish you success in the restructuring of our work.

/12858
CSO: 1800/338

SOCIAL ISSUES

DOCTOR COMPLAINS ABOUT POOR MEDICAL TRAINING FOR DRUG TREATMENT

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA on 13 January 1987 carries on page 1 a letter from V. Gogin, a physician, about the lack of knowledge and facilities for treating drug addicts. He stresses that more scientific literature on the subject is needed, and claims that many doctors are not familiar with the symptoms of drug abuse. Referring to a previously run IZVESTIYA article on the subject, Gogin says it is not surprising that in the last 9 months in Aktyubinsk health care authorities have not exposed or registered a single addict. Gogin claims that passivity on the part of the medical community is due to poor professional training.

/12858

CSO: 1830/277

SOCIAL ISSUES

GEORGIAN JUSTICE OFFICIALS WARNED OF MASSES' MORAL JUDGMENT

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 25 October 1986 carries on page 4 G. Giorgadze's 1,700-word article titled "Judiciary's 'High Priests' On Moral Trial," concerning a case involving the shady dealings of a peoples court judge in Samtredia Rayon who has protectors in the Justice Ministry, and linking that case to the unconscionable luxury of unnamed high-level party and soviet officials who enjoy maximum departmental housing benefits in Tbilisi. The article constitutes a warning that their behavior, though perhaps not subject to legal sanctions, is definitely subject to the moral judgment of "the masses," in particular "the workers and peasants who create this wealth" yet have to be content with less. Such is "the logic of social justice."

The first focus is on a dispute concerning rightful ownership of a Zhiguli which was won in a Kutaisi soccer lottery drawing by Samtredia Peoples Court Chairman O. Sturua, wrongfully using a ticket purchased by Transport MVD Chaptain G. Zibzibadze. Sturua bought the indignant Zibzibadze off with 2,500 rubles, but 6-7 months later the latter brought suit against him and was in turn immediately targeted, at Sturua's instigation, for criminal prosecution as a swindler. Both cases are in process now.

The author of the article then looks into a number of the questionable or actually unlawful actions of Chairman Sturua and states that "officials of the Justice Ministry, wrapped in the mantle of high priests," have been well aware of Sturua's doings but have extended their protection to him. Collegium meetings in March and September 1986, inquiring into his actions, concluded with nothing more than a warning. The Samtredia Raykom has taken no action.

The second focus, in the context of the spirit of new "breakthrough" and "restructuring," is on the "unseemly behavior" of officials who live in a "prestigious departmental apartment building" in Tbilisi. In stark contrast to the cheap and shoddy housing that is the lot of most people, apartments there are finely crafted, comfortable, and virtually custom-made, and even then the tenants demand extensive remodeling "to taste," with foreign furnishings and the like. The GCP Central Committee leadership has directed the Party Commission to look into the matter and submit its findings to the Buro.

The GCP Central Committee Buro meeting reported on 30 October examined the case and noted that both Sturua and Zibzibadze were expelled from the party.

Justice Ministry officials were reprimanded, and Procuracy as well as other enforcement organs were directed to crack down on such goings on.

A 200-word follow-up in KOMUNISTI on 25 November, page 2, reports that Zibzibadze has been fired for "conduct unbecoming a Soviet militia officer" and that Transport MVD Administration officials have been directed to put a stop to such instances. Nothing is said about Sturua.

CRACKDOWN ON ANONYMOUS LETTER WRITERS URGED IN GEORGIA

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 31 October 1986 carries on page 4 SOVET GYURDZHUSTANY [Soviet Georgia, the Azeri-language newspaper] Editor T. Dzhafarli's 1,900-word article castigating the "cowardly dregs" who write slanderous anonymous letters to local and high-level organs, reproaching those who openly or tacitly condone the practice, and urging that the perpetrators be unmasked, held up to public shame, and severely punished. In addition, he states that up to now too much time and energy has been expended in checking out and seeking to disprove the allegations and fabrications contained in such letters: "they should not be read at all."

Editor Dzhafarli does acknowledge a certain "understanding" of the motives of some of these "truth-seekers"--namely, fear of retribution (loss of job or "other unpleasantnesses") from persons with powerful protectors in the "hierarchy," for persecution and suppression of criticism do still exist. With the party's bold initiatives to foster public criticism, however, that motive cannot be justified. Moreover, it is imperative that officials who are universally recognized for their impeccable probity, integrity, industriousness, and civic-mindedness be spared the slanderous accusations of the "anonimshchiki." Several particular episodes are sketched [which appear to reflect Azeri locales and participants] without, however, naming any of the victims.

The author notes that the problem of anonymous letters has been underrated until now, in particular by the administrative organs. It is time to track anonimshchiki down and subject them to proper punishment--a task that is not so difficult with modern criminalistics; successful experience in Bulgaria, Hungary, and other socialist countries is proof of that.

GEORGIAN MVD CHIEF ON 'CRIMINAL TRADITIONS,' OTHER PROBLEMS

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 11 November 1986 carries on page 3 G. Chikvinidze's 3,000-word interview with MVD Chief Shota Gorgodze concerning a broad range of law enforcement and crime problems in the republic. Several paragraphs are devoted to what Minister Gorgodze calls "criminal traditions" and the "habitual criminals" [vory v zakone] who, in their inveterate "faithfulness" to those traditions, have lent them an aura of "romanticism" that warps some naive young people's minds and lures them into a life of crime.

Strong measures were successfully undertaken against criminal traditions in the early years of Soviet rule and after World War Two, but in the 1960s they enjoyed a resurgence. Now, implacable struggle has been declared. Much of the effort focuses on prophylactic measures. Substantial numbers of habitual criminals have been registered and counseled to mend their ways, but many are still at large. Those who refuse to go straight have been isolated, and those who refuse to work in the corrective colonies have been deported from Georgia. Thanks to these efforts, 9-month crime figures this year are better than last year, juvenile delinquency has declined as the kids realize the destructive falseness of romanticized crime.

Romanticized criminal traditions, along with unearned income, are also a key factor in the problem of narcotism, which is widespread among thieves, shirkers, and other persons involved in illegal activities. The problem of narcotism, therefore, will be alleviated to the same extent that false romantic notions of it are exposed and dispelled. In the same connection, considerably more narcotics cases were detected and narcotics confiscated the first 9 months of this year than last.

The work of law enforcement organs themselves is not without shortcomings. Precinct-level inspectors have not been as effective as they should be, and lack of supervision at higher levels of the MVD has permitted "misuse" of them in some cases by department heads. The corrective labor system still needs improvement--the colonies are not rehabilitating inmates sufficiently--as does party-political work. Crime statistics are up somewhat over last year, in part because of better detection and, perhaps more important, fuller disclosure. This latter consideration is of concern because of fairly widespread "figure padding" and "prettifying" of the true state of affairs in some local MVD units, whose officials have been warned not to allow crimes to go unrecorded.

The on-going campaign against unearned income has had its successes and failures, indicating the need for better MVD efforts and, in particular, better work in the various economic sectors and their auditing services. Gorgodze makes specific reference to his own Open Letter in KOMUNISTI on 11 June 1986 to top officials of the Trade and Consumer Services ministries and Tsekavshiri, to a special TV program on the subject in April 1986, and a 26 September 1986 meeting with the departmental officials concerned. Many names of specific individuals unworthy to work in those sectors were cited, and officials were urged to fire them or take other corrective measures. In the context of month-long drives against unearned income (15 May through 15 June and 15 September through 15 October), reference is made to the uncovering of widespread illegal renting of private homes, misuse of state vehicles, and illegal business activities that included both individuals and "secret business groups."

DANGERS OF FAKE COGNAC IN GEORGIA INCLUDE CIRRHOSIS AMONG YOUTH

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 22 November 1986 carries on page 4 resident "feuilletoniste" Rezo Dvalishvili's 1,000-word article about the spread of fake beverages in Georgia, in particular cognac, and the

dangers it poses to health. Acknowledging that people of his generation tend to idealize the past and to forget that negative phenomena existed then just as they do now, he asserts that beverage adulteration really is an unprecedented problem. The author recounts an incident on a train, which he witnessed, in which a VASKHNIL worker, one Kalichava, was apprehended on charges of making and selling fake cognac.

Real cognac is a great beverage, a connoisseur's delight, and takes science and artistry to make properly. Fake cognac only takes some alcohol, sugar, vanilla, and of course bottles with the right label. Unfortunately, many people are dying from cirrhosis of the liver as a result of indulgence--especially alarming is the rising incidence among young people, among whom cognac and Marlboro cigarettes are fashionable.

KOMUNISTI REPORTS NARCOTICS CASES

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 25 November 1986 carries on page 2 a 200-word follow-up on a 25 September article about narcotics cases in Tbilisi's Kalinin and October rayons and elsewhere. Responding to the report, Deputy MVD Chief G. Kvantaliani notes the measures that have been taken to clean up the situation (much of the traffic comes in from outside Georgia), including reprimands and other punishment meted out to lax MVD officials and precinct inspectors.

On page 4 of the same issue KOMUNISTI carries H. Sharikadze's 500-word article reporting raids by Zestafoni ROVD militiamen in which several named persons were caught driving under the influence of narcotics and were also found to have stashes in their cars and homes. One woman, who had never worked an honest day in her life, was found to have narcotics and a lot of money. Zestafoni Ferroalloy Plant workers were especially outraged to learn that a couple of section chiefs--and party members at that--were trafficking in drugs brought in from Krasnodar Kray.

6854

CSO: 1830/257

SOCIAL ISSUES

PROBLEMS OF NATIONALISM IN KIRGHIZIA NOTED

PM051613 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 27 January 1987 carries on pages 2 and 3 a 9,000-word KIRTAG report entitled "Strengthening Theory's Links With Practice. Republican Conference of Lecturers from Social Science Departments."

The report begins: "The implementation of the party's course of acceleration in all spheres of society and the activation of the human factor in every possible way is impossible without substantial advances in theory, including the restructuring of the social sciences, which are called upon to intensify their ideological education functions and deepen theoretical research and links with practice. To rise to the level of contemporary demands and become imbued with new ideas and the spirit of innovation and creativity--this is a most important task for philosophers, political economists, and specialists in the spheres of scientific communism, history, and other social sciences.

"Ways to resolve these problems in line with the directions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the recommendations of the all-union conference of chiefs of social science departments were the center of attention for participants in the republican conference of social scientists, which, as already reported, was held in Frunze 24 January.

"Chiefs of and lecturers at social science departments, leading social scientists, officials from party and Komsomol organs and republican ministries and departments, and representatives of mass news and propaganda media were invited to the conference."

The report gives an account of the opening speech at the conference by A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, who speaks at some length about the "truly revolutionary tasks for the renewal of our society" set by the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, the initial successes in implementing these tasks, and the role and importance of social sciences in this work. After criticizing social science work at Kirghizia's higher education establishments, Masaliyev turns to "the education of students in the spirit of friendship of peoples and socialist internationalism" and the need to develop "fraternal feelings for the Russian people," saying:

"Events in Alma-ata confirmed yet again what can happen if questions of international education are neglected. It must be admitted that instances of remarks of a nationalist nature also occur in our republic, especially among the intelligentsia and young people. Moreover, social scientists do not always firmly rebuff these negative phenomena or offer clear explanations on questions of national relations, and sometimes they even express unhealthy and apolitical views. And this spreads among the students."

The remainder of Masaliyev's speech deals with students' living and working conditions and the need to improve them, assigning the supervision of this task to the Kirghiz Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Science and Education Establishments Section.

The bulk of KIRTAG's account of the conference covers the main report delivered by K.M. Moldobayev, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, who begins by analyzing at length the prevailing situation in Kirghiz higher education, criticizing shortcomings in various higher education establishments, and outlining the steps to be taken to remedy the situation. The KIRTAG report continues:

"The speaker especially drew the attention of those present to the need to step up international education. Recently there has been noticeably more interest in history and its lessons among all strata of the population, including young people. And this interest must be actively utilized for educational purposes. Young people must be helped to interpret the sources of our successes today through understanding of the past.

"Does everyone, for example, know who was the first person in history to write down a unique cultural phenomenon like the epic poem 'Manas,' opened by Kirghizia's history for science, and involved talented Kirghiz young people in such hitherto unknown professional spheres of art like fine arts and music?

"Unfortunately not. This can be seen in particular from the written and oral statements received by the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee expressing various views and proposals as regards the study and propaganda of the cultural and scientific heritage. For example, they rarely, if ever, mention the names of Academicians Radlov and Bartold, the painter Obraztsov, the musician Zatayevich, and other figures whose importance in the establishment and development of national culture is invaluable. At the same time, individual local names are praised beyond all measure. Consequently, history's lessons are not learned well and its values are not properly assimilated. Our social scientists must give this matter some serious thought. This is also food for thought for creative unions, mass news media, and, of course, the party and Komsomol organizations.

"Our respected party and labor veterans--veterans from among the creative and scientific intelligentsia--can do much for the propaganda of abiding values of the international brotherhood of peoples. International education must be cleansed of rhetoric and verbosity. It cannot be reduced to merely organizing individual events pegged to jubilee anniversaries. However, most

VUZ's have no plans at all for international education. Questions connected with it were not discussed even once in 5 years at sessions of scientific councils at the University (Comrade Shaymergenov) or the Agricultural Institute (Comrade Gaydamako).

"Negative phenomena like home-town favoritism, nepotism, and protectionism, which occurred in many VUZ's in the recent past, have seriously damaged international education and the affirmation of a spirit of brotherhood and friendship of peoples. Quite often student collectives were formed on this basis. There are distortions in their national composition. Nor can one describe as normal a situation where the national structure of the republic's population is by no means everywhere taken into account when staffing the social science departments. As a result about 70 percent of lecturers working in these departments are representatives of the indigenous nationality. They account for over 90 percent of the staff in many departments like, for example, the History of the CPSU Departments at the university, the Agricultural Institute (Comrade Sulaymanov), and the Przhevalsk Teacher Training Institute (Comrade Dzhunushev). These excesses must be firmly corrected.

"Profound study of the party's Leninist nationalities policy as part of the social sciences course must be geared to shaping active international views and beliefs among students. But this most important question is evidently underestimated. Special courses on these problems are not available anywhere. Nor do they occupy a suitable place in scientific research.

"Survival of nationalism and instances of national prejudice and narrow-mindedness are most often encountered at the level of contacts between individuals. It is at this level that one notices more clearly national egoism and protectionism and unjustified attribution of various negative phenomena (drunkenness, speculation, careerism) to aspects of 'national character.' This makes it necessary to step up in every possible way the cultivation of high standards of inter-nation contacts among students. This must include ethics of international behavior, tact in approaching differences between nations, and acceptance of the specific features, culture, and habits of people belonging to other nationalities.

"It is serious errors in international education and in the teaching of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the history of the USSR and Kirghizia at VUZ's and technical colleges that we must perceive the displays of national narrow-mindedness and immature statements by a small proportion of students. Like, for example, former students Abdykadyrova of the Women Teacher Training Institute, Toktogulova of the Medical Institute, and Subakozhoyev of the university.

"What is even worse is that nationalist prejudices are sometimes cultivated by some lecturers. Lapsing into the most vulgar philistinism, they indulge in dirty nationalist attacks in front of the student audience. They include Usupov, lecturer at the Physical Culture Institute, Abdyldayev, senior lecturer at the Osh Teacher Training Institute, and some others.

"The absolute majority of the republic's population sharply condemned the nationalist and hooligan outbursts by some young people in Alma-ata. There were, however, some individuals who could be described as two-faced and who tried to foist their nationalist fantasies on others. Some social science lecturers were among them. Today we must say most clearly: there is no room for such people not only in social science departments but in pedagogical work altogether. It cannot be otherwise. After all, Marxist-Leninist ideology can be successfully propagandized only by people with a clear conscience who stand firm on the principles of party and class commitment."

After speaking briefly about students' practical sociopolitical work, Moldobayev moves on to the topic of religion: "Profound restructuring is needed in atheist education. The leading and guiding role of the inter-VUZ department of scientific atheism (Comrade Doyev) does not make its presence felt here.

"Criticism of the Islamic religion and various clerical forms of anticommunism is at times conducted in a simplistic and insufficiently well argued fashion. Individual work with students is replaced by mass events catering for some kind of abstract, averaged audience. As a result of this, some VUZ graduates subsequently display a confused world outlook and lack firm ideological positions and views. Take the following fact. The funeral of almost all deceased members of the indigenous nationality in rural areas still involves the performance of the religious ritual of dzhanaz (the burial service). Orthodox church rituals are also actively practiced. Yet a large detachment of the intelligentsia--teachers, physicians, veterinarians, and so on--lives and works in the countryside. They are all former students. Why are they not seen to adopt a stance as militant materialists? The passive contemplation and indifference displayed by a considerable section of our intelligentsia are causing concern. This is not the stance we must cultivate. We need people of action, specialists with fighting qualities, people who are uncompromising and implacable toward everything that hinders progress. Party and public organizations at VUZ's and technical colleges and social scientists are doing far too little in this respect."

The remainder of Moldobayev's speech contains further recommendations for improvements in the work of social science departments and higher education establishments in general.

/9738

CSO: 1830/251

SOCIAL ISSUES

UZBEK OFFICIAL HAILS INTERREPUBLIC CADRE EXCHANGE

PM071641 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Timur Alimov, first secretary of Tashkent Uzbek Communist Party Obkom and USSR Supreme Soviet deputy: "The Creative Force of Fraternity. Exchange of Cadres Between Republics Accelerates Country's Socioeconomic Development"]

[Text] Lidiya Kazantseva came to Tashkent from the Moscow region as a young girl together with her mother, a weaver, and during the war began working at a machine tool alongside her. Mariya Kovaleva, a tractor driver from Voronezh, and Pavel Saulkin from Penza came to Uzbekistan on Komsomol travel warrants during the fifties--again, not for an easy life: Mariya came to work on the virgin lands, Pavel to work on a laggard kolkhoz.

Over the years the new, unfamiliar region became their home and its concerns became theirs. All these people are today Heroes of Socialist Labor, and what they have done for the republic is widely known. The multiple machine tending movement in the weaving industry is associated with the name of Lidiya Pavlovna, and the introduction of intensive techniques in cotton growing with that of Mariya Aleksandrovna, team leader and machine operator on the "Kreml" Sovkhoz. The "40 Let Oktyabrya" Kolkhoz, which Pavel Fedorovich heads, has proved that while sowing cotton it is also possible and necessary to conduct high-marketability livestock raising and thereby to help the republic manage with smaller meat and milk subsidies.

When you talk with each of them you see how much they have borrowed from the good customs and experience of a region that was new to them, but at the same time how many good things they have given from the wellspring of Russia's traditions, how many useful people they have raised, and how many people they have taught their trades to. Here are a few names: U. Bukurova from Kovaleva's team is today a team leader herself and a party raykom bureau member. A pupil of Saulkin's, kolkhoz economist M. Abdukarimov, is a rayispolkom chairman. And a pupil of Kazantseva's, K. Yakubayeva, is a renowned weaver and a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy.

Those are three ordinary working people's biographies. But how vividly their lives express the movement and essence of our time.

It is noteworthy that as far back as the first 5-year plans weavers and spinners from the Moscow region and Ivanovo went to help their friends in Tashkent and Fergana and hundreds of Uzbek lads went to Orekhovo-suyevo and Shuya. Labor veterans among former assistant foremen and electricians who received their party cards at Russian plants and factories are thriving to this day.

The inter-nation exchange of cadres is now a matter of state planning. Nowadays this broad and multifaceted process is an important factor in economic and social progress, and the distinctive new features evoked by the peculiarities of the present day are displayed in it. But the time is also throwing up new problems. These are primarily linked with the demographic situation characteristic of the Central Asian republics.

It is paradoxical but a fact that, notwithstanding the high natural population growth and the surplus unemployed manpower, many enterprises and construction projects in our republic experience an acute shortage of manpower. The result is incomplete shifts at enterprises and a low capacity utilization index. At the same time it is clear that we cannot forever reinforce cadres by shipping workers into the republic. The question of the faster training of our own skilled workers is arising acutely.

Let us be forthright: We knew of this problem in Uzbekistan before, but we did not really tackle it. The low percentage of worker cadres belonging to the local nationality is one reason for the republic's lag in terms of a number of most important indicators, and the tenacity of religious and private ownership survivals is also linked with it.

Today the situation is beginning to change. Certain enterprises in Tashkent and the metallurgical plant in Bekabad have tackled in real earnest the training of their next generation of workers. However, even now, for instance, the proportion of Uzbek workers at our tractor plant or at "Tashselmash" is only half the figure for the proportion of Uzbeks among the republic capital's population. How do we envisage rectifying the situation?

Here is one way that we think is fruitful. In the present 5-year plan around 1 million teenagers will graduate from vocational and technical schools in our republic. The party obkom and the oblispolkom are resolutely correcting the leaders of those departments that are in no hurry to expand the network of rural vocational and technical schools. This year schools in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia took 3,000 of our young men and women, including 600 kids from Tashkent who are studying at rural vocational and technical schools in Ivanovo and Volgograd Oblasts. During the 5-year plan we hope to train 3,000 young workers for the oblast in this way and at least 15,000 for the republic as a whole.

The RSFSR, the Ukraine, the Belorussia will help Uzbekistan in educating professionally competent, cultured, socially active young people. All these measures must also evoke a flow in the opposite direction.

There is yet another facet of the problem. The usual thing used to be for workers and specialists to come to us--to construction projects, enterprises, and the virgin lands. Now the situation is changing. The RSFSR is today experiencing its own manpower shortage. The time has come for us too to help our friends, including with highly skilled cadres.

Large detachments of workers and specialists from Uzbekistan are today helping boost the Non-Chernozem Zone, are irrigating the trans-Volga steppes, are constructing highways and housing in the north of the Tyumen region, are repairing oil wells in Samotlor, and are working on the Baykal-amur railroad. By the end of the 5-year plan the number of representatives of our republic engaged in opening up new economic regions will top 30,000, and the annual volume of work they perform will reach R0.5 billion. These must be regarded as only our first steps.

Moreover, eight oblasts in Uzbekistan in which there is surplus manpower have established direct links with RSFSR krays and oblasts that do not have enough cadres of their own: for instance, Khorezm Oblast has link with Chita Oblast, Bukhara Oblast has links with Tomsk Oblast, and Tashkent Oblast has links with Ivanovo Oblast. Thus we are consolidating the links that we have had with the people of Ivanovo Oblast for several decades now. We are also making provision for the voluntary migration of families from our zones to Russian regions, and we will also send large detachments of seasonal workers there, including some to agroindustrial complex construction projects.

This initiative did not emerge merely on paper; it is evoked by life itself. For instance, Ivanovo Oblast, after the special "Uzbekistan-Ivanovo" train carrying over 130 families--546 people--from our valleys who were migrating to the Volga region, was sent large detachments of seasonal workers to construct highways and livestock units for their farms.

But it has to be said that complex problems in the new links have already emerged. Migrants from the south do not always find the promised housing and normal living and working conditions in their new homes. Expenditure on moving people under the terms of direct-link contracts has not yet been included in the plans and financial documents. But also we ourselves back home must fundamentally improve the selection of volunteer migrants and seasonal workers for the new economic regions.

Moreover, I think that the time has come to employ a whole system of organizational and social measures to "boost" the mobility of the Central Asian population, especially the young people, to overcome the inertia of their attachment to the "land of their fathers," and to instill in them a desire for a "change of scene." Something that is to assist this is the substantial restructuring of the system for studying the language of inter-nation communication--Russian--that has been started in our republic.

In our view, the exchange between republics of experienced organizers in the political, administrative, and economic spheres is equally important. As is well known, a struggle against negative phenomena was mounted in Uzbekistan 3 years ago. They included a practice that had flourished in the republic--promoting people to leadership posts not on the basis of their professional, political, and moral qualities but on grounds of home town ties, kinship, nepotism, and servility. The decay of the apparatus affected a considerable proportion of personnel at the rayon, oblast, and republican levels. Many people had to be replaced.

In this process we utilized the resources of the strengths embodied in the multinational composition of the party organization itself and the oblast's elective organs. Thus Bostanlykskiy Raykom First Secretary A. Aydarkulov, a Kazakh, was elected obkom secretary, Rayispolkom Chairman Kh. Pirnapasov, a Turkman, was elected party rayon first secretary, and Tajik R. Khikmatulloyev and Kirghiz S. Shermatov were recommended as raykspolkom chairmen from the cadre reserve.

Chinazskiy Rayon was in turmoil because of passions aroused by local favoritism. When the question came up of whom to recommend as rayon first secretary there, everyone was agreed--V.G. Grishchuk. He came to our republic from the Ukraine as a young lad over 30 years ago, after graduating from a tekhnikum. He became a livestock specialist on a laggard kolkhoz, helped boost the farm, and learned the local languages. He received higher education via a correspondence course and did Komsomol and party work. The squabbles ceased as though by magic and the rayon emerged among the leaders.

We have so many comrades inwardly prepared for responsible work! Last year 82 percent of party gorkom and rayon secretaries and gorispolkom and rayispolkom chairman and deputy chairmen who replaced people relieved of their duties were promoted from the reserve. Thanks to this the oblast has consolidated its rate of development in terms of virtually all indicators of industrial and agricultural production.

Nonetheless, when we began to impose order in the republic and the vigorous replacement of unsuitable personnel was needed, it immediately became obvious that we could not manage merely with our own cadre reserve. Here once again we have felt with new force the assistance of the CPSU Central Committee. At the request of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee mature party members, Soviet organ personnel, and experienced economic leaders from Moscow, Leningrad, and krays and oblasts in the RSFSR and other republics are being sent to work permanently in the republic.

Some people in our republic, to say nothing of people abroad in the West, are prepared to portray the measures to strengthen the leadership link in the republic as virtually an antinational campaign. The positive improvements that have been taking place in Uzbekistan in recent years demonstrate the sheer futility of such attempts. We ourselves are becoming still more strongly convinced of the urgent need to strengthen and develop the foundations of all our everyday internationalist practice.

It is now obvious to everyone that the assistance to Uzbekistan in the form of cadres of organizers of party, Soviet, and economic work is dictated by the party's concern for returning the republic as speedily as possible to the mainstream of fullblooded political and economic life, as wide as the Grand Fergana Canal, and further increasing its contribution to the country's national economic complex.

There are many similarities between these people and the party emissaries to Turkestan during the first years of Soviet power. Today so far as these Communists are concerned the assignments to work in our republic are not simply a duty but also an impulse from the heart. To go with your family from the banks of the Neva to Kzyl Kumy, to move from fertile Belgorod to the Karshi steppe or from icy Chelyabinsk to sultry Tashkent. To embark on a new life, to assume responsibility for work of incomparably large scale and complexity, and to encounter the need for drastic measures is not easy. So the desire of these people to share our difficulties with us is all the more valuable. As is their energy and skill, and their readiness to plunge into work and to share their knowledge and experience with others--in short, everything that our new comrades have brought into our life.

1. Ovsyuk has been at the Uzbek metallurgical plant for less than a year and has not had time yet to realize all his plans, but the director's tempering in the Urals is having an effect and there is already progress. Captain N. Tynkiv came to the metallurgists' city of Almalyk to head the internal affairs section there. Much has now changed in the work of the militia in that city.

A characteristic point is that Uzbekistan also teaches these people a great deal. As a rule, they have more responsible sectors of work here. Bigger and on a larger scale. E. Rizayev, who was originally from here and returned to Tashkent after party work in Murmansk, has been promoted to first deputy chairman of the capital's gorispolkom. A. Klepikov from Voronezh, who spent 2 years working at Tashkent Oblispolkom, has been elected first secretary of Syr-darya party obkom--that oblast is one of the most multinational ones in our republic.

On the other hand it is now very important to ensure that our young people gain experience in the country's major industrial centers. We send a large detachment of promising personnel, mostly belonging to local nationalities, to central organs there--they will later form the leadership cadre reserve for Uzbekistan and other republics.

There is another flow of people going from Uzbekistan to the country's major industrial and cultural centers for 18- and 24-month party and soviet aktiv training stints. The directors and chief specialists from major associations and plants and leaders of large construction projects undergo refresher courses there. The contingent of students from Uzbekistan at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and USSR Academy of the National Economy has been increased, and many of our young workers study in party schools in Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Rostov, Saratov, and Sverdlovsk.

Thus the inter-nation exchange of cadres is growing and expanding. Today it is a vivid manifestation of the Leninist nationalities policy, which is based on mutual assistance, equality, and unbrekable friendship between all peoples of our Soviet land.

/9738

CSO: 1830/251

REGIONAL ISSUES

GEORGIA: EXTENT OF SNOWFALL DAMAGE, RESCUE WORK NOTED

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 87 p 6

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent G. Lebanidze: "Endurance and Steadfastness" First paragraph is source introduction.]

[Text] Georgian SSR--As already reported in PRAVDA, there have for several weeks been unprecedented snowfalls in the mountains of Georgia. Today we describe the details of the invasion of the elements.

The days have passed, but the snowfall has continued, and the snow drifts have continued to build up. So has people's concern. Bewilderment has appeared in the eyes of the elderly residents: after all, they recall nothing like it in their lifetime. This has been confirmed by the weather forecasters also: such weather has not been recorded in the mountains of Georgia in the past 50 years. In some places the snow cover has reached 5 meters. Peals of thunder are heard from time to time in the ravines--sweeping before them all in their path, these are the snowslides which have begun to roll down. Covering the roads, they have cut off many towns and villages from the "mainland" and centers of the following rayons--Mestiyskiy, Dushetskiy, Lentekhskiy, Tsagerskiy and Kazbekski. Power supplies have been cut off, and telephone communications have been interrupted. Many apartment houses have found themselves under avalanches of snow, and there have been human casualties.

The drifts and the banking have put out of operation more than 350 km of roads, approximately 200 km of high-voltage power lines, 200 km of main communications lines and also other engineering structures and service lines. A number of agricultural, industrial, municipal and socio-cultural facilities have suffered also.

People's steadfastness and cohesion have been counterposed to the elements. The Ministry of Highways, Ministry of Communications and the Gruzglavenergo have everywhere in the areas of the disaster organized the precise and prompt operation of their subdivisions. Up to 200 pieces of road equipment and means of transport and also doctor and mountain climbing teams were urgently dispatched here. Special engineering subdivisions are determining the potential avalanche zones and adopting measures to eliminate them.

The men of the Transcaucasus Military District have earned truly nationwide gratitude. Their military training and selflessness have to a considerable extent lessened the tragic consequences of the blows of the elements. They have cleared roads, rescued people and set up communications.

Workers of the kolkhoz farms of two villages of Lentekhskiy Rayon found themselves in a difficult situation. Helicopter pilots flew in here. They could not land, it is true, but, hovering directly above the stockbreeders' rest huts, they dropped produce.

It was particularly difficult for those clearing the 100-km stretch of road from Tsageri to Tsani and also on the 7-km stretch not far from the small town of Latkariya, on the road linking Tsageri and Lentekhi. It was no joke that an avalanche of snow of 10,000 cubic meters crashed down on the road, covering completely the Tskhenistskali ravine, tearing down power and telephone lines. But thanks to the selflessness and courage of the group of the rayon's communications men, the telephone system was quickly restored. The Kutaisi airmen, who have been continuously delivering freight to the victims and carrying people out of the danger zones, have been models of valor at this time also.

"A particularly difficult situation took shape in the Gudauri sports complex," O. Ye. Cherkeziya, chairman of the government commission and chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, told the PRAVDA correspondent. "The snow was 4 meters high here. Some 590 people, including 250 children, were guests here at this time. They were all cut off from the outside world. Highway workers, bulldozer operators, graders and snow-shifting equipment began to make their way toward them over the 50-km Voyenno-Gruzinskaya Highway through fog and avalanches. Only on the third day did the weather permit aircraft to take off. Three crews of the Georgian Civil Aviation Administration worked nonstop from morning until late evening. They succeeded in bringing out all the snowbound people."

Tens of kilometers of power lines and highways have been restored and the population is being rendered assistance in provision with fuel, food, medicines, warm clothing, heating appliances and other basic necessities as a result of the concerted efforts. Approximately 1,500 persons have been evacuated from the avalanche-danger zones. In addition, measures are being adopted to resettle 400 families from the Mulakhskiy Rural Soviet away from the danger zones.

The rescue and repair operations continue.

8850

CSO: 1830/233

REGIONAL ISSUES

ECONOMIC, ECOLOGICAL, SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF GEORGIAN HIGHLANDS

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 29 October 1986 carries on page 4 a 2,500-word environmental feature under the regular rubric "Nature--The Door of Life," consisting of three articles and an editorial introduction. The introduction links the feature to an international seminar on the theme "Ecological and Social-Economic Problems of Mountain Regions," organized by UNESCO, other UN agencies, and USSR and Georgian bodies.

Doctor of Geography E. Kobakhidze's 1,700-word contribution sketches the importance of Georgia's highlands in terms of the economy, the environment, and people's wellbeing generally, and notes some of the problems caused by "human economic activity." One of the worst problems, however, is the continuing virtual depopulation of some highland districts, especially those on the south slopes of the Caucasus. The Racha-Lechkhumi district [present-day Ambrolauri, Oni, and Tsageri rayons] is "a classic example" of this depopulation: fewer people live there now than at the end of the 19th century. Many highland rayons lost from 10 to 20 percent of their population from 1970 through 1985. There are, to be sure, a few bright spots, namely Svaneti [Mestia Rayon] and Adjara. Nevertheless, a particularly worrisome aspect is that the elderly comprise an increasing share of the highland population. In Racha, one-third are pensioners; more people die there than are born. In general, income is much lower than in the valleys (about one-half). Industrialization, productivity, the social infrastructure, and agricultural activities are all lower. Transportation is a problem.

The author proposes that these districts be turned around by extensive resort and tourism development, citing as examples the case of the prospering Borzhomi district and other on-going or projected recreational complexes that produce national income and help build population centers. Major transportation projects such as the Marabda-Akhalkalaki Railroad and the future Transcaucasus railroad and highway hold great promise in this regard as well.

A 300-word article by Docent G. Margviani focuses briefly on problems of mountain agriculture and how to prevent erosion on steep slopes.

Finally, Candidate of History E. Batiashvili's 500-word article focuses on several related negatives: specifically, too many young people who have settled in the mountains in recent years are leaving again--the author

likens this phenomenon to a "contagious disease" and states that it makes the ringing slogan "The Mountaineer Has Returned to the Highlands" mere empty words. He then turns to the problem of heavy spending that has often failed to achieve its purpose, for example the big investment in Black Seacoast construction that has failed to halt extensive coastal erosion, and costly power line construction in the highlands that has proved far from reliable. For the latter problem he proposes the intensive development of small GESes on highland streams and canals as well as more use of solar and wind power in order to provide reliable, environmentally clean local energy.

GEORGIAN MILITIA CONTINGENT ACCOMPANIED VIRGIN LANDS HARVESTERS

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 29 October 1986 carries on page 2 D. Berdzenishvili's and I. Nikiforov's 500-word article about the excellent work done by a Georgian GAI [State Automotive Inspectorate] contingent that accompanied Georgian volunteers who went to North Kazakh Oblast to help bring in the harvest. The GAI group, headed by two lieutenant colonels, patrolled the roads on which Georgian truck drivers hauled the grain in order to maintain order. It was the first time such a measure was undertaken. The staff was in constant radio and telephone liaison with their Kazakh colleagues, and a temporary party group was formed as well. Thanks to their efforts, there were no serious infractions or other problems.

LONG-TERM GEORGIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EXAMINED

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 1 November 1986 carries on pages 1 and 3 Sh. Amashukeli's and G. Chikvinidze's 1,200-word report of an expanded Gosplan meeting that examined the integrated long-range program of Georgian SSR regional social-economic development to the year 2000, known as "Georgia 2000-Regions" for short. The brainchild of Professor V. Melkadze of the Scientific-Research Institute for Economics, Planning, and Administration of the National Economy, it was first drafted in 1977 and finally approved in 1980. Some 70 governmental and economic bodies collaborated on the program, which maps plans for the 82 regions and 8 "natural-economic zones" of the republic, the focus being on social as well as economic development, with special emphasis on harmonizing territorial and sectorial interests and bringing about "rapprochement" among the various districts.

The original program ("variant") has been amended, and although projected growth figures, for example, differ from the old variant, they are close enough that it reflects great credit on the multitudinous staff of the Scientific-Research Institute and collaborating bodies; this latter theme is emphasized more than once. The present variant is based on 1985 data.

The authors inform readers that some encouraging surprises are in store, for example "unprecedented changes" to come in Dusheti and Dmanisi rayons, where per capita industrial output is to rise from 174 to 2,662 rubles and 121 to

3,923 rubles, respectively, by 2000. The article lists a number of the most eminent Gosplan and other officials who took part in the meeting.

MORE INDEPENDENCE URGED FOR GEORGIAN HIGHLAND KOLKHOZES

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 1 November 1986 carries on page 2 N. Dzhavelidze's 3,600-word article recounting a tour of the Bostana village and kolkhoz in Ambrolauri Rayon, whose economic and social fortunes appear to be on the rise since the appointment of a dynamic new kolkhoz chairman, Gurgen Darakhvelidze. The author traces the drastic decline of that once viable district and Racha generally (mainly Ambrolauri and Oni rayons) to mistaken policies undertaken in the 1950s--namely, premature consolidation of small kolkhozes that led to the loss of local leadership, deterioration of local social and management infrastructure, falling productivity, and wholesale migration. That the situation has yet to be turned around indicates that "we have failed to draw the correct conclusions...and to determine why peasants are becoming workers" instead of building up the district's excellent agricultural potential.

Among other matters the author points out that "during collectivization and after the war," all the kolkhozes had their own produce outlets in the rayon centers, where they sold a great variety of farm products at prices set by the kolkhoz assembly. A similar practice has now taken hold in many parts of the USSR and Georgia (i.e., sales of kolkhoz surpluses at city bazaars) which, in the author's own opinion, does not work against state interests. "It is the way to revival; all that is needed is more independence and freedom for individual kolkhozes."

The article offers several other proposals: higher purchase prices to reward the labor of stock herders, who have to work much harder than the staffers of the stock farms [fermy]; allocation of some mountain woodland tracts for kolkhozniks to clear and farm the land (governmental restrictions on which go back to Tsarist times); revival of the breeding of oxen as draft animals; acquisition of "small-scale mechanization" suitable for rough mountain terrain; building of roads; planting of certain kinds of shrubs and other vegetation to prevent erosion and provide wild berries; giving preference to small local manufacturing shops in the villages, instead of major affiliates in the rayon centers, in order to provide jobs and halt migration; encouraging inter-regional economic (investment) agreements between Kakheti [eastern Georgia] and Racha to take advantage of the latter's abundant and virtually deserted hay and grazing lands.

NO 'OUTSIDE WORKERS' NEEDED YET TO BUILD TRANS-CAUCASUS RAILROAD

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 6 November 1986 carries on page 3 D. Bitsadze's 700-word interview with Gela Makharadze, head of the shtab in charge of Komsomol units of construction workers for the grandiose Trans-Caucasus Railroad project that is just getting underway. The first Georgian Komsomol contingents are to go on the job this year; Makharadze notes that Georgian Komsomol members have abundant experience working on big projects all over the USSR, such as the Baykal-Amur Railroad. Great care

has been taken to provide housing and all the amenities for young people on this project. There have been plenty of applicants, and only those with sound construction experience are being selected.

In a brief exchange, the interviewer asks whether workers will be recruited "from outside Georgia." The answer is that there are no plans for organized recruitment of such in the next 2 years, as labor resources in Georgia and North Ossetia are quite sufficient "if utilized rationally."

GEORGIAN UNIT FORMED TO MONITOR, INTERVENE IN OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

[Editorial Report] Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian on 16 November 1986 carries on page 4 Gruzinform correspondent A. Kikodze's 500-word interview with Professor Vera Vashakidze, director of the Health Ministry's Scientific-Research Institute for Hygiene of Labor and Occupational Diseases, concerning the formation of a new Scientific-Medical Treatment-Production Association of which her institute is a "partner" along with the Zestafoni Ferroalloy Plant, the Makharadze Natanebi Kolkhoz, the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, and the Rustavi Metallurgical Plant. The "partnership" enables medical scientists not only to devise preventive measures and monitor their implementation but also to intervene in technological processes they deem hazardous and demand changes. Medical services of the industrial outfits themselves are obliged to conduct worker examinations and monitor progress. The new association grew out of previous working relationships which successfully introduced improved hygienic and safety conditions resulting, for example, in a 40-percent reduction in occupational disorders at the Zestafoni facility.

6854

CSO: 1830/258

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

22 April, 1987